application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the city of Chico.

Issued in Hawthorne, California, on January 8, 1999.

Herman C. Bliss,

Manager, Airports Division, Western-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 99–1735 Filed 1–25–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket No. MARAD–99–5019]

Information Collection Available for Public Comments and Recommendations

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 this notice announce the Marine Administration's (MARAD's) intentions to request extension of approval for three years of a currently approved information collection.

DATES: Comments should be submittted on or before March 29, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTRACT: Christopher Krusa, Office of Maritime Labor, Training, and Safety, Maritime Administration, MAR–250, Room 7302, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202–366–2648 or fax 202–493–2288. Copies of this collection can also be obtained from that office.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title of Collection: Supplementary Training Course Application.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved information collection.

OMB Control Number: 2133–0030.

Form Number: MA–823.

Expiration Date of Approval: October 31, 1999.

Summary of Collection of Information: Section 1305 (a) of the Maritime Education and Training Act of 1980 states that the Secretary may provide additional training on maritime subjects and may make such training available to the personnel of the merchant marine of the United States and to individuals preparing for a career in the merchant marine. Also, the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) requires a fire fighting certificate for U.S. merchant marine offficers, effective December 1989, pursuant to 46 CFR 10.205(g) and 10.207(f).

Need and Use of the Information: This information collection is necessary for eligibility assessment, enrollment, attendance verification and recordation. Without this information, the courses would not be documented for future reference by the program or individual student. This application form is the only document of record and is used to verify that students have attended the course.

Description of Respondents: U.S. Merchant Seamen, both officers and unlicensed personnel, and other U.S. citizens employed in other areas of waterborne commerce.

Annual Responses: 2,000 responses.

Annual Burden: 100 hours.

Comments: Signed written comments should refer to the docket number that appears at the top of this docuement and must be submitted to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. Specifically, address whether this information collection is necessary for proper performance of the function of the agency and will have practical utility, accuracy of the burden estimates, ways to minimize this burden and ways to enhance quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected. All comments received will be available for examination at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., ET. Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays. An electronic version of this document is available on the World Wide Web at http://dms.dot.gov.

By Order of the Maritime Administrator.

Dated: January 21, 1999.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–1771 Filed 1–25–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA 98–4603, Notice 1]

Ford Motor Company; Receipt of Application for Determination of Inconsequential Non-Compliance

Ford Motor Company, of Dearborn, Michigan, has applied to the Administrator, for exemption from the notice and remedy requirements of this application concerning certain 1998 model year Ford F150, F250, Expedition vehicles, and Lincoln Navigator vehicles, which have sun visor air bag warning labels that do not fully meet the location requirements of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 208 ''Occupant Crash Protection.'' Pursuant to Part 573 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Defect and Noncompliance Reports, Ford Motor Company submits the following information concerning a safety-compliance action that it is initiating.

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 S4.5.1.(b)(3) of FMVSS 208 specifies ''Except for the information on an air bag maintenance label placed on the sun visor pursuant to S4.5.1(a) of this standard, no other information will appear on the same side of the sun visor to which the sun visor warning label is affixed.'' Ford manufactured approximately 91,600 vehicles in total (certain F150, F250, and Expedition 4X4 models, and certain Lincoln Navigator 4X4 and 4X2 models) from February 13, 1998 through May 21, 1998, that did not comply with this requirement. The affected 4X4 models were built with driver sun visors with air bag warning labels *and* 49 CFR 575.105 (c)(1) utility vehicle labels both affixed to the same sun visor side. The affected Lincoln Navigators equipped with moonroofs (both the 4X4 and 4X2 models) were built with a temporary paper label for the garage door opener transmitter *also* located on this same side of the visor.

The noncompliance was created when Ford implemented a sun visor label running change on February 13, 1998, for the affected vehicles. Prior to the change, the air bag alert label specified in FMVSS 208 S4.5.1(c), along with the 575.105(c)(1) utility vehicle label on the 4X4 models, and the garage door opener transmitter label on the moonroof equipped Navigator 4X4 and 4X2 models, were affixed to the driver sun visor on the side visible with the visor in the stowed position. The air bag warning label on these vehicles was affixed to the opposite side of the visor with no other labels located on this opposite side. The label running change eliminated the air bag alert label, and the air bag warning label was located in its place on the side of the visor visible when stowed. However, the utility vehicle label already located on that side of the visor on the 4X4 models, and the garage door transmitter label located on the side directly below the transmitter controls on the moonroof equipped Navigator visors, were not relocated.

Ford argued that, based on rulemaking history, the intent of the FMVSS 208 air bag warning label location requirement is to ensure that customers have access to important air

bag safety information, and to avoid ''information overload'' that could blunt the impact of this air bag information. The basic question with regard to these non-compliant vehicles is, therefore, does the presence of the utility vehicle label on the transmitter label on the same side of the visor as the air bag warning label actually detract from motor vehicle safety, and further, would the removal of the utility vehicle label and the garage door opener transmitter label from these vehicles enhance motor vehicle safety? Removal of the utility vehicle label is a possible field fix since the affected vehicles all have wheelbases that exceed 110 inches. Even though the utility vehicle label is *required* only on these types of vehicles with wheelbases of 110 inches or less, Ford nevertheless believes the information on the label may also be beneficial in utility vehicles with over 110 inch wheelbase, and affixes the labels to these vehicles also. The transmitter label is a temporary paper stick-on label intended to be removed by the customer, and in all likelihood is removed early in the life of the vehicle. It is provided merely as a customer convenience and directs the customer to operational instructions provided in the Owner Guide. Ford believes this is beneficial to the vehicle operator.

Supporting Arguments

For the following reasons, in Ford's view, the presence on the driver visor of the utility vehicle label or the transmitter label does not significantly detract from the air bag warning, and has no consequential effect on motor vehicle safety. First, the warning label is prominently displayed on both the driver and passenger visor, on the side visible when the visor is stowed. The label is thus visible the majority of the time. Second, the revisions to the air bag label requirements published on November 27, 1996—the addition of a pictogram, specified minimum area for message text, colors for a pictogram, text, and background—have effectively increased the air bag label's prominence and readability such that the presence of this utility vehicle label or the transmitter label, both of which are uniquely different in appearance from the air bag warning label, is unlikely to detract from the much more prominent air bag label. Finally, the affected vehicles do not require and are not equipped with the air bag maintenance label specified in S4.5.1(a) and, consequently, the air bag warning label need not compete with this maintenance label, thus reducing that potential for ''information overload.'' In addition, the fact that S4.5.1(a) allows the air bag maintenance label to be placed on the same side of the visor with the air bag warning label provides explicit recognition by the agency that the risk of ''information overload'' from other labels on the visor is manageable. Based on these facts, Ford believes that the effectiveness of the air bag warning label is not significantly diluted by the presence of the utility vehicle label. They believe the same is true with regard to the temporary presence of the transmitter label.

Ford offers the following concerning the question of whether removal of the utility vehicle label or the transmitter label from the affected vehicle enhances motor vehicle safety. With regard to the utility vehicle label, the industry and the agency have and are considering, whether the presence of this label along with the air bag warning label, do in fact reduce the effectiveness of the air bag label. There is not complete agreement on this subject as evidenced by rulemaking including a January 13, 1997 AAMA Request for Technical Amendment or Petition for Reconsideration, to allow both labels on the same side of the visor—this request/petition was denied by the agency on June 24, 1998 (49 CFR 575.208). Citation for utility vehicles NPRM 63 FR 17974 April 13, 1998, Docket No. NHTSA 98–3381, Notice 1.

The transmitter label on the Navigators' vehicles on the other hand, a paper stick-on label which directs the customer to the Owner Guide for instructions on the operation of the transmitter controls on the visor, is not intended to be permanent, but is designed as a temporary label with the expectation that it will be removed early in the life of the vehicle. Because its early removal is intended, Ford does not argue that a field action to remove this label would be detrimental to safety, however, because Ford believes it will be removed by the customer, or by the dealer after review with the customer during delivery of the vehicle, Ford suggests there is no need for such a field action.

As a final point, the subject utility vehicle and transmitter labels, rather than being affixed, as they are, on the driver visors no closer that 2 inches from the air bag warning label, which does not satisfy Standard 208, alternatively could have been affixed to the vehicle headliner immediately above and approximately 2 inches away from the visor air bag label. This alternative would have been completely compliant with Standard 208, even though the proximity of these labels to the air bag warning label would have been essentially the same as with the non-compliant location on the visor. If, in this alternate compliant location, the air bag warning label is not diluted by the presence of the utility vehicle or transmitter label on the headliner, perhaps 2 inches away, Ford suggests that the air bag warning label is not diluted by the technically non-compliant presence on the visor of these labels which also are approximately 2 inches away from the air bag label.

In summary, Ford believes that the presence of the utility vehicle label or the garage door opener transmitter located two inches or more from the air bag warning label, does not constitute ''information overload,'' nor does it present any risk to motor vehicle safety. Ford requests that the agency find this condition to be inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and accordingly that Ford be exempted from the notice and remedy requirements of the Code. Ford has attached to this petition their June 23, 1998 letter to the agency advising of this condition, and of Ford's intent to petition for a determination of inconsequential noncompliance.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments on the application of Ford, described above. Comments should refer to the Docket Number and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL 401 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. It is requested but not required that two 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: February 25, 1999. (49 U.S.C. 30118,30120; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8)

Issued on: January 19, 1999.

L. Robert Shelton,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 99–1744 Filed 1–25–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

January 19, 1999.

The Department of Treasury has submitted the following public