

addition, the IFR Fuel Requirements/Destination and Alternate Weather Minimums Working Group will present a revised concept briefing at the meeting, and the ARAC members will vote whether or not the working group should include the revised concept when it drafts its recommendation. Members of the public may contact Cindy Herman, ARM-108, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, S.W. Washington, DC 20591, (202) 267-7627, fax (202) 267-5075 to obtain a copy of the briefing prior to the meeting.

Attendance is open to the interested public but may be limited to the space available. The public must make arrangements in advance to present oral statements at the meeting or may present written statements to the committee at any time. In addition, sign and oral interpretation can be made available at the meeting, as well as an assistive listening device, if requested 10 calendar days before the meeting. Arrangements may be made by contacting the person listed under the heading **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Issued in Washington, DC on July 19, 1995.

**Roger M. Baker, Jr.,**

*Acting Assistant Executive Director for General Aviation Operations, Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.*

[FR Doc. 95-18384 Filed 7-25-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

## Maritime Administration

[Docket S-922]

### **OMI Patriot Transport, Inc., et al.; Application for Modification of Operating-Differential Subsidy Agreements**

By application of April 27, 1995, pursuant to Title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and Article II-25 of Operating-Differential Subsidy Agreements (ODSAs) No. MA/MSB-167 (a), (b), (c) and (d), OMI Patriot Transport, Inc., OMI Courier Transport, Inc., and OMI Rover Transport, Inc. requested approval for modification of Article I-3(a) of the ODSAs to incorporate the OMI COLUMBIA in the ODSAs and approval to include the OMI COLUMBIA in an Operating-Differential Subsidy (ODS) sharing system among the vessels named in the ODSAs. The vessels currently named in the ODSAs, under an ODS sharing arrangement are the COURIER, PATRIOT, RANGER, ROVER, OMI MISSOURI, and OMI SACRAMENTO.

The OMI COLUMBIA, which is owned by OMI Challenger Transport, Inc., is a 138,698 DWT U.S.-flag crude oil tanker that began operating in 1983 on a time charter basis in the Alaska North Slope crude oil trade, following its reconstruction and documentation under U.S.-flag pursuant to the Wrecked Vessel Act (46 app. U.S.C. 14). The applicants note that for the last two years, however, the OMI COLUMBIA has been operating in the spot market and has been in laid up status for most of that time.

The applicants believe that a subsidy sharing arrangement for the OMI COLUMBIA would result in critically needed operating flexibility for the vessel. The OMI COLUMBIA is a highly efficient, diesel powered vessel that could compete effectively in the foreign trade with subsidy. The applicants point out that the entry of the OMI COLUMBIA into the foreign trade would enhance the presence of the U.S.-flag fleet in a trade where the U.S.-flag presence is far too small. Furthermore, the expansion of U.S.-flag service in the foreign commerce is the primary goal of the ODS program and one that would be furthered by permitting the OMI COLUMBIA to be incorporated into the subsidy sharing agreement enjoyed by other OMI-owned vessels.

At a time when the U.S. merchant marine is fighting to remain strong and competitive, the applicants aver that every permitted use of available subsidy should be allowed. In the applicant's view, no statutory restriction limits subsidy to tank vessels under 100,000 DWT; the restriction is a matter of informal policy only. The applicants maintain that circumstances have changed markedly, providing a substantial basis for modification of the deadweight limitation policy.

The applicants' position is that the modification needed is modest. The deadweight tonnage of the OMI COLUMBIA is not significantly higher than the informal limitation. In addition, the total amount of subsidy to be paid is not increased by this contract modification. Consequently, the subsidy is simply used to maintain another U.S.-flag vessel in active service in the U.S. merchant marine.

Granting the OMI COLUMBIA subsidy sharing rights, the applicants conclude, will enable the OMI COLUMBIA to enhance U.S.-flag service in the foreign trade and will help maintain a trained base of U.S. seafarers.

This application may be inspected in the Office of the Secretary, Maritime Administration. Any person, firm, or corporation having any interest in such application and desiring to submit

comments concerning the application must file written comments in triplicate with the Secretary, Maritime Administration, Room 7210, Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20590. Comments must be received no later than 5:00 p.m. on Aug. 2, 1995. This notice is published as a matter of discretion and publication should in no way be considered a favorable or unfavorable decision on the application, as filed or as may be amended. The Maritime Administrator will consider any comments submitted and take such action with respect thereto as may be deemed appropriate.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 20.804 (Operating-Differential Subsidies)).

By Order of the Maritime Subsidy Board.  
Dated: July 21, 1995.

**Joel C. Richard,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-18379 Filed 7-25-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-81-P

## National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 95-57; Notice 1]

### **General Motors Corporation; Receipt of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance**

General Motors Corporation (GM) of Warren, Michigan, has determined that some of its vehicles fail to comply with the requirements of 49 CFR 571.108, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 108, "Lamps Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment," and has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports." GM 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 FMVSS No. 108, Paragraph S5.5.10(d) requires that "all other lamps [not mentioned in Paragraphs S5.5.10(a)-c) which includes all stop lamps such as enter high-mounted stop lamps (CHMSLs)] shall be wired to be steady-burning."

During the 1995 model year, GM manufactured a total of 96,607 GMC and Chevrolet Suburban, GMC Yukon, and

Chevrolet Tahoe vehicles that have CHMSLs that were inadvertently wired in a manner which permits the CHMSLs to momentarily flash under certain conditions while the driver is in the process of activating or deactivating the hazard flashers. As a result, they do not meet the requirement stated in Paragraph S5.5.10(d) that they be "wired to be steady-burning." While GM designed the subject vehicles to meet this requirement, it subsequently discovered a transient contact condition inside the multi-function (brake lamp, CHMSL, turn signal, and hazard flasher) switch which occasionally causes the CHMSL to flash while the driver is in the process of turning the hazard flasher switch "on" or "off." The error was corrected in production in March 1995 by adding a brake lamp relay to the I/P harness to provide isolation from the multi-function switch transient.

GM supports its application for inconsequential noncompliance with the following:

The CHMSL preforms properly at all times when the service brakes are applied. The transient condition will not occur if the service brakes are applied when the driver activates or deactivates the hazard flasher switch. Therefore, the CHMSL will not flash when it is required to be steady-burning. The CHMSL will not flash if the ignition switch is in the "off" position. Thus, the condition will not occur if the hazard flashers are turned "off" or "on" when the ignition is off and the vehicle is parked at the side of the road, for example.

If the CHMSL flashes at all, it will illuminate a maximum of three times during the transient condition, with each pulse lasting 0.5 [millisecond (ms)] to 4.0 ms. The entire unintended event, in its worst case, lasts no more than 125.8 ms. This extremely short duration is likely to go entirely unnoticed by following drivers in many instances. In the event that it is noticed, it is not likely to be confused with anything other than the hazard flashers. Since the flashers will be activated while the unintended condition occurs, but the brake lamps will not be, this will not present a safety risk.

The CHMSL otherwise meets all of the requirements of FMVSS 108.

In a 1989 interpretation, NHTSA discussed the difference between the requirements that stop lamps be steady-burning and hazard warning lights flash. NHTSA explained:

Standard No. 108 requires stop lamps to be steady-burning, and hazard warning signal lamps to flash (generally through the turn signal lamps). The primary reason for the distinction is that the stop lamps are intended to be operated while the vehicle is in motion, while hazard warning lamps are intended to indicate that the vehicle is stopped. Each lamp is intended to convey a single, easily recognizable signal. If a lamp which is ordinarily steady burning begins to flash, the agency is concerned that the signal will prove confusing to motorists, thereby diluting the effectiveness.

August 8, 1989 letter from S.P. Wood, Acting Chief Counsel, NHTSA, to L.P. Egley

While this condition technically causes a lamp which is ordinarily steady burning to begin to flash, it will not likely "prove confusing to motorists, thereby diluting its effectiveness," because it will not occur if the service brakes are applied. Even if the condition were mistaken for a brake signal (which is doubtful since CHMSLs do not flash with brake lamp activation), the following driver would not likely react to it. According to recent research studies conducted by GM, as well as field data, it takes a following driver at least 0.5 seconds to react to a signal and apply the service brakes once [a] preceding vehicle's brake lamps are activated. Given the extremely short duration of the transient CHMSL condition, the misinterpreted signal would be gone long before the following driver could respond.

Hazard flashers are not frequently used. Thus, the exposure of following drivers to the noncompliant condition would be very limited. This is particularly true because of the transient nature of the condition, its short duration, and the fact that it will not occur at all if the service brakes are applied or the vehicle's ignition is off.

GM is not aware of any accidents, injuries, owner complaints, or field reports related to this condition.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on the application of GM described above. Comments should refer to the docket number and be submitted to: Docket Section, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Room 5109, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, D.C., 20590. 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: August 25, 1995.

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

Issued on: July 21, 1995.

**Barry Felrice,**

*Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.*

[FR Doc. 95-18383 Filed 7-25-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Customs Service

#### Privacy Act of 1974: Altered System of Records

**AGENCY:** Customs Service, Treasury.

**ACTION:** Notice of altered system of records.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, 5 U.S.C. 552a, the United States Customs Service gives notice of an altered Privacy Act system of records, Internal Security Records System—Treasury/Customs .127. The title, as amended, will be Internal Affairs Record System—Treasury/Customs .127.

**DATES:** Comments must be received no later than August 25, 1995. The altered system of records will be effective September 5, 1995, unless comments are received which would result in a contrary determination.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be sent to the Disclosure Law Branch, Office of Regulations and Rulings, U.S. Customs Service, 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20229. Comments will be made available at the Office of Regulations and Rulings, U.S. Customs Service, Franklin Court, 1099 14th Street, NW., Suite 4000, Washington, DC.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kathryn C. Peterson, Chief, Disclosure Law Branch, Office of Regulations and Rulings, (202) 482-6970.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This report is to give notice of an altered U.S. Customs Service system of records entitled "Internal Security Records System—Treasury/Customs .127" which is subject to the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a.

The Customs Service is amending its present system of records covering personnel and administrative records for the following reasons:

1. To more fully describe, by the addition of photographic images, the records about the individual in the system,

2. To show additional categories of individuals covered by the system.

The altered system of records report, as required by 5 U.S.C. 552a(r) of the Privacy Act, has been submitted to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Office of Management and Budget, pursuant to Appendix I to OMB Circular A-130, Federal Agency Responsibilities