

termination or the effective date of the amendment, provided that:

(a) No such notice need to be given if the only material effect of an amendment is to reduce or eliminate the sales charge payable at the time of a rollover; and

(b) No notice need to be given if, under extraordinary circumstances, either—

(i) There is a suspension of the redemption of units of the Rollover Trust under section 22(e) of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder, or

(ii) A Reinvestment Trust Series temporarily delays or ceases the sale of its units because it is unable to invest amounts effectively in accordance with applicable investment objectives, policies and restrictions.

2. The sales charge collected at the time of any rollover shall not exceed 2.0% of the public offering price of the unit being acquired on each rollover.

3. The prospectus of each Reinvestment Trust Series and any sales literature or advertising that mentions the existence of the Rollover Option will disclose that the Rollover Option is subject to modification, termination or suspension.

For the Commission, by the Division of Investment Management, pursuant to delegated authority.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-3283 Filed 2-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Notice of order Adjusting the Standard Foreign Fare Level Index

[Docket 37554]

Section 41509(e) of Title 49 of the United States Code requires that the Department, as successor to the Civil Aeronautics Board, establish a Standard Foreign Fare Level (SFFL) by adjusting the SFFL base periodically by percentage changes in actual operating costs per available seat-mile (ASM). Order 80-2-69 established the first interim SFFL, and Order 94-12-15 established the currently effective two-month SFFL applicable through January 31, 1995.

In establishing the SFFL for the two-month period beginning February 1, 1995, we have projected non-fuel costs based on the year ended September 30, 1994 data, and have determined fuel prices on the basis of the latest available experienced monthly fuel cost levels as reported to the Department.

By Order 95-2-9 fares may be increased by the following adjustment factors over the October 1979 level:

Atlantic.....	1.3924
Latin America	1.4213
Pacific.....	1.7999
Canada.....	1.5129

For further information contact: Keith A. Shangraw (202) 366-2439.

By the Department of Transportation:
February 3, 1995

Patrick V. Murphy,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs.

[FR Doc. 95-3223 Filed 2-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-62-P

Notice of Order Adjusting International Cargo Rate Flexibility Level

Policy Statement PS-109, implemented by Regulation ER-1322 of the Civil Aeronautics Board and adopted by the Department, established geographic zones of cargo pricing flexibility within which certain cargo rate tariffs filed by carriers would be subject to suspension only in extraordinary circumstances.

The Standard Foreign Rate Level (SFRL) for a particular market is the rate in effect on April 1, 1982, adjusted for the cost experience of the carriers in the applicable ratemaking entity. The first adjustment was effective April 1, 1983. By Order 94-12-16, the Department established the currently effective SFRL adjustments.

In establishing the SFRL for the two-month period beginning February 1, 1995, we have projected non-fuel costs based on the year ended September 30, 1994 data, and have determined fuel prices on the basis of the latest available experienced monthly fuel cost levels as reported to the Department.

By Order 95-2-8 cargo rates may be adjusted by the following adjustment factors over the April 1, 1982 level:

Atlantic.....	1.1709
Western Hemisphere	1.1160
Pacific.....	1.3994

For further information contact: Keith A. Shangraw (202) 366-2439.

By the Department of Transportation:
Dated: February 3, 1995.

Patrick V. Murphy,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs.

[FR Doc. 95-3222 Filed 2-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-62-P

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Denial of Petition

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

By letter dated July 8, 1994, Mr. Kurt B. Chadwell petitioned NHTSA to reopen its closed defect investigation (Engineering Analysis, EA92-030) of power steering fluid leakage and resulting engine compartment fires in 1988 through 1990 Ford Taurus, Mercury Sable, and Lincoln Continental vehicles equipped with 3.8 liter engines. The petition also asked the NHTSA take all actions necessary to compel the Ford Motor Company (Ford) to initiate a safety recall of the 429,000 subject vehicles to remedy the alleged defect. By letter dated September 14, 1994, Mr. Chadwell provided additional information. By letter dated November 9, 1994, Mr. Chadwell requested that the investigation be expanded to include Taurus and Sable vehicles equipped with 2.5 liter and 3.0 liter engines.

The following are principal elements of the subject petition:

- The petitioner takes issue with NHTSA's decision to close the original investigation in October 1993.
- The petitioner states that Ford has followed an organizational practice of under-reporting to NHTSA the numbers of known failure incidents in this as well as in other investigations.
- The petitioner provides a document maintained by the U.S. Fire Administration in its National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS), which lists engine compartment fires in Taurus, Sable, and Lincoln Continental vehicles equipped with 2.5 liter, 3.0 liter, and 3.8 liter engines. These data are presented as the basis for the petitioner's request that the investigation be expanded to include those vehicles with 2.5 liter and 3.0 liter engines.

In support of his claims, the petitioner discusses information taken from NHTSA's public record concerning EA92-030, other defect investigations, and other issues regarding compliance with Federal motor vehicle safety standards. In addition, he cites his personal experience as a former employee of Ford.

Regarding the specific petition elements as outlined above, the first represents a basic disagreement with NHTSA's conclusion in closing EA92-