Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to the space available. With the approval of the subcommittee chairman, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present oral statements, obtain information, or attend the meeting should contact Ms. Nancy Lane, AIR–510, 800 Independence Ave., SW., Washington, DC at (202) 267–7061, who will serve as the FAA Designated Federal Official to the Subcommittee.

Members of the public may present a written statement to the Subcommittee at any time.

Issued in Washington, DC, on September 12, 1995.

Randall J. Stevens,

Acting Manager, Research Division.

[FR Doc. 95–23111 Filed 9–15–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Flight Service Station at Deadhorse, Alaska; Notice of Change in Facility Operation

Notice is hereby given that on or about October 14, 1995, the Deadhorse, Alaska, Flight Service Station (FSS) hours will change permanently from operating 24 hours a day to operating from 6:00 a.m. to 9:30 p.m. daily. Services to the general aviation public provided by this facility will be provided by the Automated Flight Service Station (AFSS) at Fairbanks, Alaska, during the hours the Deadhorse FSS is closed. This information will be reflected in the FAA Organization Statement the next time it is reissued. Sec. 313(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, 72 Stat. 752; 49 U.S.C. App. 1354(a).

Issued in Anchorage, Alaska on September 7, 1995.

Jacqueline L. Smith,

Regional Administrator, Alaskan Region.

[FR Doc. 95–23094 Filed 9–15–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Flight Service Station at Iliamna, Alaska; Notice of Change in Facility Operation

Notice is hereby given that on September 30, 1995, the Iliamna, Alaska, Flight Service Station (FSS) will close until May 1, 1996. Upon reopening on May 1, 1996, the hours of the Iliamna FSS will be 5:45 a.m. to 9:45 p.m. From that date on, Iliamna FSS will operate annually as a seasonal facility, open March 1 through September 30, 5:45 a.m. to 9:45 p.m. When open, Iliamna FSS will operate as a full-service FSS. Services provided to the general aviation public by this facility when open, will be provided by the Automated Flight Service Station at Kenai, Alaska, when Iliamna FSS is closed.

This information will be reflected in the FAA Organization Statement the next time it is reissued. Sec. 313(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, 72 Stat. 752; 49 U.S.C. App. 1354(a).

Issued in Anchorage, Alaska on September 7, 1995.

Jacqueline L. Smith,

Regional Administrator, Alaskan Region.

[FR Doc. 95–23093 Filed 9–15–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Federal Railroad Administration

Notice of Application for Approval of Discontinuance or Modification of a Railroad Signal System or Relief From the Requirements of Title 49 CFR Part 236

Pursuant to Title 49 CFR Part 235 and 49 U.S.C. App. 26, the following railroads have petitioned the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) seeking approval for the discontinuance or modification of the signal system or relief from the requirements of Title 49 CFR Part 236 as detailed below.

Block Signal Application (BS–AP)–No. 3365

Applicant: Consolidated Rail Corporation, Mr. J.F. Noffsinger, Chief Engineer—C&S, 2001 Market Street, P.O. Box 41410, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101–1410.

Consolidated Rail Corporation (Conrail) seeks approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of ''CP Esplen'' Interlocking, milepost 2.4, on Conrail's Mon Line, Pittsburgh Division, and discontinuance of the Form D Control System on the single main track Carnegie Secondary, near Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The proposed changes are associated with track reconfiguration and extension of the No. 2 main track southward to ''CP Beck'' on the Mon Line. The proposed changes include: conversion of the Carnegie Secondary to an industrial track; conversion of old No. 1 power-operated switch to hand operation; removal of signals 3E, 3S, 22N, and 21N; installation of new ''CP 2'' near milepost 3.0 on the Mon Line; and installation of an electrically lock hand-operated switch north of ''CP 2'' for the industrial track connection on track No. 2.

The reason given for the proposed changes is to facilitate the extension of track No. 2, which is necessitated by increased coal traffic on the Mon Line.

BS–AP–No. 3366

Applicant: Burlington Northern Railroad Company, Mr. William G. Peterson, Director of Signal Engineering, 1900 Continental Plaza, Fort Worth, Texas 76102–5304.

The Burlington Northern Railroad Company seeks approval of the proposed modification of the traffic control system on the two main tracks, near Alliance, Nebraska, on the Alliance Division, Angora Subdivision, consisting of the discontinuance and removal of ''Prairie'' control point, milepost 3.1 and the reduction of the traffic control system limits from ''Prairie'', milepost 3.1 to ''South Alliance'', milepost 4.53.

The reason given for the proposed changes is to make better use of signals in a traffic congested area.

Any interested party desiring to protest the granting of an application shall set forth specifically the grounds upon which the protest is made, and contain a concise statement of the interest of the protestant in the proceeding. The original and two copies of the protest shall be filed with the Associate Administrator for Safety, FRA, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590 within 45 calendar days of the date of issuance of this notice. Additionally, one copy of the protest shall be furnished to the applicant at the address listed above.

FRA expects to be able to determine these matters without oral hearing. However, if a specific request for an oral hearing is accompanied by a showing that the party is unable to adequately present his or her position by written statements, an application may be set for public hearing.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on September 12, 1995,

Phil Olekszyk,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Compliance and Program Implementation.

[FR Doc. 95–23115 Filed 9–15–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 95–77; Notice 1]

Cantab Motors, Ltd.; Receipt of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Cantab Motors, Ltd. (Cantab) of Purcellville, Virginia, had determined that some of its vehicles fail to comply with the automatic restraint system

requirements of 49 CFR 571.208, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 208, ''Occupant Crash Protection,'' and has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, ''Defect and Noncompliance Reports.'' Cantab 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.

This notice of receipt of an application is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the application.

Paragraph S4.1.4 of FMVSS No. 208 requires that vehicles manufactured on or after September 1, 1989, be equipped with a restraint system at each front outboard designated seating position that meets the standard's frontal crash protection requirements by means that require no action by vehicle occupants. This type of system is referred to as an automatic restraint system.

The agency granted an exemption for Cantab to manufacture vehicles without automatic restraints between May 16, 1990 and May 1, 1993. Cantab imported and manufactured nine vehicles without automatic restraint systems during this time period. However, after the exemption had expired, Cantab imported and manufactured nine more vehicles without automatic restraint systems. Of these nine vehicles, seven entered the U.S. during 1994 and two in 1995. These vehicles all meet the requirements of Standard No. 208 prior to the implementation of automatic restraint requirements. Cantab has subsequently applied for an exemption from the automatic restraint requirements for this type of vehicle. Notice of receipt of its application was published on July 14, 1995 [60 FR 36328].

Cantab supports its application for inconsequential noncompliance with the following:

> [Cantab] submits that, during the entire time period subsequent to its initial grant of exemption in May of 1990, it has imported and manufactured a total of eighteen cars. Nine of these were imported during the period of exemption, nine subsequent to its lapsing and prior to [Cantab's] submission of a second application for exemption. Each of these eighteen cars were identically constructed to meet all applicable FMVSS, including those of FMVSS 208 prior to implementation of the automatic restraint requirements. During this time, [Cantab] has made substantial progress in the development of a dual air bag system and expects to have it installed and operative within a year.
>
> [Cantab] has previously suggested to NHTSA in its [May 10, 1995] petition for exemption, the unusual nature of its vehicles—cars driven by enthusiasts for pleasure, rather than daily for business commuting or on long trips, by people who own two or more other passenger cars for such purposes.
>
> [Cantab] respectfully suggests that its nine noncomplying cars, representing a minuscule proportion of the total number of motor vehicles sold and operated in the U.S. during the period of 1994–1995, operated as noted above, constructed with well-proven safety systems, would not materially affect overall motor vehicle safety, and that their operation would be in the public interest and would be consistent with the objectives of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on the application of Cantab, described above. Comments should refer to the docket number and be submitted to: Docked Section, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Room 5109, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, D.C., 20509. It is requested but not required that six copies be submitted.

All comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated below will be considered. The application and supporting materials, and all comments received after the closing date will also be filed and will be considered to the extent possible. When the application is granted or denied, the notice will be published in the Federal Register pursuant to the authority indicated below.

Comment closing date: October 18, 1995.

(15 U.S.C. 1417; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8)

Issued on: September 12, 1995.

Barry Felrice,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 95–23055 Filed 9–15–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–M

[Docket No. 95–76; Notice 1]

Ford Motor Company; Receipt of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Ford Motor Company (Ford) of Dearborn, Michigan has determined that some of its vehicles fail to comply with the display identification requirements of 49 CFR 571.101, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 101, ''Controls and Displays,'' and has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, ''Defect and Noncompliance Report.'' Ford 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.

This notice of receipt of an application is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the application.

In Footnote 3 to Table 2 in Standard No. 101, it is specified that, ''[i]f the odometer indicates kilometers, then 'KILOMETERS' or 'km' shall appear, otherwise, no identification is required.''

Ford manufactured approximately 300,000 vehicles (1995 model year Rangers, Explorers, Crown Victorias, and Grand Marquis, certain 1994 and 1995 Mustangs, and certain 1995 Ford-built Mazda B-Series pickup trucks) which may not comply with the display identification requirements of Standard No. 101. Within the total population of 300,000 vehicles, any number of between 24 and 124 vehicles were manufactured with an odometer that measures distance in units of kilometers but is not labeled as such as Standard No. 101 requires. Ford has already found and corrected 24 of these noncompliant odometers in service, therefore, up to 100 of them could still exist.

Ford supports its application for inconsequential noncompliance with the following:

> In Ford's judgment, this condition is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety. [Ford's] basis for this belief is that: 1) an owner of an affected vehicle will readily recognize the condition and return the vehicle to a Ford dealer for corrections; 2) even if the condition were to go undetected, the role of the odometer in alerting drivers to potential safety-related problems is minimal; and 3) no reports of accidents or injuries related to this condition are known or expected.
>
> Ford believes, as evidenced by those odometers already identified by owners, that this condition becomes obvious to an owner early in the ''life'' of a vehicle because of more rapid mileage accumulations, better than expected fuel economy, etc., and that an owner will seek repair for the condition through a Ford dealer. Ford will continue to remedy the condition of any of the vehicles brought to its attention at no cost to the owners, under normal warranty terms.
>
> With respect to the relationship of the odometer to safety, in past rulemaking (FR Vol. 47, No. 216 at 50497) the agency concluded that the role of the odometer in alerting drivers to potential safety-related problems is not crucial. This conclusion was among those leading to the rescission of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 127, Speedometers and Odometers. That standard contemplated that the purpose of the odometer requirement was twofold. First,