and use the revenue from a PFC at Pellston Regional Airport of Emmet County 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 February 21, 1996, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by the County of Emmet 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 May 22, 1996.

The following is a brief overview of the application:

PFC Application No.: 96–04–C–00–PLN
Level of the proposed PFC: $3.00
Proposed charge effective date: April 1, 1996
Proposed charge expiration date: May 31, 1997
Total estimated PFC revenue: $27,600.00
Brief description of proposed project(s): Expand automobile parking lot; Rehabilitate automobile parking lot; Rehabilitate Taxiway ''B''; Install chain link fence.
Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: air taxis and charters.

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 County of Emmet.

Issued in Des Plaines, IL, on March 5, 1996.

Benito De Leon,

Manager, Planning/Programming Branch, Airports Division, Great Lakes Region.

[FR Doc. 96–5833 Filed 3–11–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Federal Railroad Administration

Notification of Funds Availability for Next Generation High-Speed Rail Corridor Studies

AGENCY: Federal Railroad Administration; Department of Transportation.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1996, (Public Law 104–50 (November 15, 1995)), the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) has $1 million in next generation high speed rail funds available for grants to eligible participants for high speed rail corridor planning assistance, including preliminary engineering and operational analysis, and other planning activities. This notice sets forth the criteria by which FRA will make its selection of grant recipients. The FRA strongly supports the advancement of high-speed rail in congested corridors where it can be an important component of a balanced transportation system. Further, FRA believes the development or continuation of high-speed rail in specific corridors should be undertaken as a partnership of states, localities, and the private sector, with support from the Federal government. Pursuant to the Swift Rail Development Act of 1994, (Public Law 103–440 (November 2, 1994)), the Secretary may provide financial assistance to a public agency or group of public agencies for corridor planning for up to 50 percent of the publicly financed costs associated with eligible activities. Not less than 20 percent of the publicly financed costs associated with eligible activities shall come from State and local sources, which State and local sources may not include funds from any Federal programs.

CRITERIA FOR FUNDING: Eligible participants are encouraged to submit a request for this funding which addresses the following criteria:

1. The level of interest in the chosen corridor demonstrated by State, regional, and local governments and elected officials or other interested groups. Interest can be shown by the past and proposed financial commitments and in-kind resources of State and local governments and the private sector.

2. The extent to which the proposed planning focuses on systems which will achieve sustained speeds of 125 mph or greater.

3. The degree of integration of the corridor into metropolitan area and statewide transportation planning.

4. The potential interconnection of the corridor with other parts of the Nation's transportation system, including the interconnection with other countries.

5. The anticipated effect of the corridor on the congestion of other modes of transportation.

6. Whether the work to be funded will aid the efforts of State and local governments to enhance compliance with Federal environmental laws and regulations.

7. The estimated level of ridership and the estimated capital cost of corridor improvements, including the cost of closing, improving, or separating highway-rail grade crossings.

8. Whether a specific route has been selected, specific improvements identified, and capacity studies completed, and whether the corridor has been designated as a high-speed rail corridor under Section 1010 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, Public Law 102–240 December 18, 1991).

ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS: Any state government, local government, organization of state and/or local governments, or any combination of such entities is eligible to apply for funding.

DEADLINE FOR REQUESTS FOR GRANT APPLICATIONS: Eligible participants desiring to apply for this funding, should notify FRA by letter, and FRA will respond initially by providing a standard grant application package. For priority consideration, FRA requests that the completed grant application packages be returned to the below address by June 30, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Applications should be submitted to: Honorable Jolene M. Molitoris, Administrator, Federal Railroad Administration, ATTN: RDV–11, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Room 8206, Washington, D.C. 20590.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John F. Cikota at (202) 366–9332.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on March 5, 1996.

Jolene M. Molitoris,

Federal Railroad Administrator.

[FR Doc. 96–5821 Filed 3–11–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Denial of Petition for a Defect Investigation

This notice sets forth the reason for the denial of a petition submitted to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) under 49 U.S.C. § 30162(a)(2) (formerly section 124 of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, as amended).

By letter dated July 26, 1995, R. David Pittle, Ph.D., Vice President and Technical Director of Consumers Union (CU), petitioned the Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) to investigate the Century Model 590 child safety seat. Dr. Pittle's request was based on testing conducted 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 is currently scheduled to take effect in September 1996. This report responds only to that portion of Dr. Pittle's letter which petitioned the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) to begin an investigation to determine whether a product defect recall of the Century Model 590 should be instituted under the provisions of 49 CFR Part 577. Those issues concerning CU's petition seeking amendments to FMVSS No. 213 will be responded to separately.

Century was the first manufacturer to develop an infant/child restraint that snaps into a base that can be left in the car. The seat, the Model 590, was introduced in 1992. 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 Century 590 is designed to be used only in a rearward facing position by children less than 20 pounds in weight.

The Century 590 seat base fractured in 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.

Under S7.1 of FMVSS No. 213 as currently in effect, a seat that is recommended by its manufacturer for use by children up to 20 pounds is tested in the rearward facing position in a 30 mph dynamic test using a ''six-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 a 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 equivalent to 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.

S6 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 of the test sled entirely within the curve shown in figure 2 of the 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. Even though the pulse differences in various sleds are usually very small and are recorded in increments of milliseconds (1/1,000 of a second), they can produce significantly different results. 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.

FMVSS No. 213 has been revised, and the revised requirements are currently scheduled to take effect on September 1, 1996 (petitions for reconsideration are currently pending). 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).

The petitioner reported that when it tested Century Model 590 seats in the rearward-facing position with a 20-pound dummy at a speed of very slightly over 30 mph, with the seat mounted on the seat base, three of the seats tested exhibited fractures. In all three cases the base for the seat, which was belted onto the test sled with a conventional seat belt, fractured and the seat, which contained the dummy, was released from the base on one or both sides. This could create a serious problem, because in an actual collision the portion of the child restraint that holds the child could impact unfriendly portions of the vehicle's interior or allow the child to be ejected from the vehicle.

Century submitted numerous test results, the majority of which were characterized as tests on ''Experimental'' seats. In some of the tests, a 17-pound dummy was used, although most used a 20-pound dummy. In the majority of the tests submitted, the seats passed FMVSS No. 213 requirements, although there were isolated failures.

One 1994 Model 590 seat was tested by the NHTSA Vehicle Research and Test Center (VRTC) in Marysville, Ohio, using a 17-pound dummy. Later tests also using a 17-pound dummy were conducted for NHTSA by Calspan Advanced Technology Center (Calspan), Buffalo, N.Y. In the test conducted in Marysville, Ohio (VRTC Test RCU–01—September 18, 1995) the base fractured on the right side and the seat back deflected more than the 70 degrees specified by FMVSS No. 213. However, the acceleration pulse curve fell slightly outside the pulse limits described in FMVSS No. 213.

Later tests of two seats conducted for NHTSA at Calspan (December 12, 1995) resulted in both seats passing the requirements of FMVSS No. 213. (Unlike the September 18, 1995 tests, these were conducted in accordance with all FMVSS No. 213 test procedures.)

Century reported that it had received no owner reports of failure in which the base cracked and a ''catastrophic separation'' of the safety seat from the base occurred. According to Century, this is the type of failure alleged in the CU petition. Century did, however, provide reports from owners and users of the subject seat who allege the seat separated from the base in collision situations.

NHTSA has reviewed all reported cases of the safety seat separating from the base, including those where the base fractured and those where the base released without fracture. NHTSA has received 9 reports of the Century seat separating from the base in collision situations. Century reported 7 additional incidents, although Century maintains these incidents are not identical to the CU test failures. Of these 16 reports, it is alleged that the base fractured in at least 5 of the collisions. In the other eleven collision reports, no information is included as to whether the base fractured or not. In 8 of the 16 reports, the separation of the seat from the base occurred when the vehicle was struck on the side.

In its petition, CU provided the agency with data indicating that the Century Model 590 seat may separate from its base 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. It should be pointed

out that a review of tests involving the Century Model 590, in particular the VRTC test of September 18, 1995, suggests that the performance of some seats manufactured in 1994 may be marginal.

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 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 equipment is defective. Thus, given the fact that the Century Model 590 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.

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. However, the information developed regarding the reported failures of Century Model 590 seats in actual vehicle collisions merits further analysis. NHTSA will, therefore, initiate a Preliminary Evaluation to further investigate the actual collision performance of this seat in side impact crashes, which are not covered by FMVSS No. 213 or any other Federal motor vehicle safety standard.

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

Issued on: March 6, 1996.

Michael B. Brownlee,

Associate Administrator for Safety Assurance.

[FR Doc. 96–5801 Filed 3–7–96; 10:36 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation

Advisory Board; Notice of Meeting

Pursuant to Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92–463; 5 U.S.C. App. I) notice is hereby given of a meeting of the Advisory Board of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, to be held at 2:00 p.m., March 27, 1996, at the Corporation's Washington, DC office, 400 7th Street, SW., Suite 5424, Washington, DC 20590 via conference call. The agenda for this meeting will be as follows: Opening Remarks; Consideration of Minutes of Past Meeting; Review of Programs; Business; and Closing Remarks.

Attendance at meeting is open to the interested public but limited to the space available. With the approval of the Acting Administrator, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing further information should contact not later than March 20, 1996, Marc C. Owen, Advisory Board Liaison, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590; 202–366–0091.

Any member of the public may present a written statement to the Advisory Board at any time.

Issued at Washington, DC on March 5, 1996.

Marc C. Owen,

Advisory Board Liaison.

[FR Doc. 96–5767 Filed 3–11–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–61–M

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of Management, Department of Veterans Affairs.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: As part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, the Office of Management invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on this information collection. This request for comment is being made pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–13; 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). Comments should address the accuracy of the burden estimates and ways to minimize the burden including the use of automated collection techniques or the use of other forms of information technology, as well as other relevant aspects of the information collection.

DATES: Written comments and recommendations on the proposal for the collection of information should be received on or before May 13, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Ron Taylor, Office of Management (045A4), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20420. All comments will become a matter of public record and will be summarized in the request for Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval. This document solicits comments concerning the following information collection:

OMB Control Number: 2900–0548.

Title and Form Number: Voluntary Customer Surveys to Implement Executive Order 12862—Department of Veterans Affairs.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Need and Uses: In compliance with Executive Order 12862, the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) will continue to conduct a series of qualitative and quantitative information collections to determine the kind of services its direct and indirect customers want, as well as customer levels of satisfaction with existing services. The surveys will solicit voluntary opinions. They will not be used to collect information required to obtain or maintain eligibility for a VA program or benefit. Baseline data obtained through these information collections will be used to develop customer service standards. VA is requesting generic approval to conduct a series of information collections over the next 3 years.

Current Circumstances: VA conducts a variety of activities to implement the Executive Order. If these activities were not conducted, VA would be unable to comply with the Executive Order, and would not have the information needed to establish standards for the best possible customer-focused service. VA uses the information gathered to determine where and to what extent services are satisfactory, and where and to what extent they may be improved. The information collected may lead to policy changes to enhance or streamline VA's overall operations.

Affected Public: Individuals and households—Business or other for—profit-Not-for-profit institutions—State, Local or Tribal Government.

Estimated Annual Burden: 611,428 hours.

Estimated Average Burden Per Respondent: 30 minutes (average).

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 305,714.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of collection of information proposal should also be directed to Department of Veterans Affairs, Attn: