

to grant waterfront facilities and vessels permits to conduct Hot Works and welding activities.

Coast Guard proposed use of this information is to ensure that waterfront facilities and vessels are in compliance with safety standards.

Burden Estimate and Frequency: The current total annual respondent burden estimate is 2,190 hours. The average burden hour per response is 5 minutes reporting. The frequency of recordkeeping will be occasionally.

Title: Plan Review for Facilities With Vapor Control Systems.

OMB No: 2115-0581.

Affected Entities: Owners/operators of vessels and facilities with vapor control systems.

Abstract: This information is used by the Coast Guard to ensure compliance with safety regulations. This allows the use of welding or other "hot-work" equipment on a designated waterfront facility.

Under Title 33 CFR 126.15(c), 33 CFR 127.617, 33 CFR 154.735(k)(1) and 49 CFR 176, Coast Guard has the authority to grant waterfront facilities and vessels permits to conduct Hot Works and welding activities.

The Coast Guard proposed use of this information is to ensure that waterfront facilities and vessels are in compliance with safety standards.

Burden Estimate and Frequency: The current total annual respondent burden estimate is 2,190 hours. The average burden hour per response is 5 minutes reporting. The frequency of recordkeeping will be occasionally.

Title: Ships' Stores Certification for Hazardous Materials Aboard Ships.

OMB No: 2115-0139.

Affected Entities: Suppliers and manufacturers of hazardous products used on ships.

Abstract: Ships' Stores Certification—Title 46, CFR, Part 147 requires proper identification and labeling of dangers presented by hazardous ships' stores. The regulation provides manufacturers the opportunity to request waivers for products in special DOT hazard classes to be used aboard ships.

Title 46 U.S.C. 3303 authorizes the Coast Guard to regulate the transportation, stowage and use of ships' stores and supplies of a dangerous nature.

Coast Guard will use this information to ensure personnel aboard vessels are made aware of the proper usage and stowage instructions to protect them from bodily injury.

Burden Estimate and Frequency: The current total annual respondent burden estimate is 6 hours. The average burden

hour per response is 3 hours reporting. The frequency of reporting will be occasionally.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on May 10, 1996.

Phillip A. Leach

Clearance Officer, United States Department of Transportation.

[FR Doc. 96-12267 Filed 5-15-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-P

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: Cleveland County, NC

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice of intent to advise the public that an environmental impact statement (EIS) will be prepared for a proposed highway project in Cleveland County, North Carolina.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mr. Roy Shelton, Operations Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, 310 New Bern Avenue, Suite 410, Raleigh, North Carolina 27601, Telephone (919) 856-4350.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the North Carolina Department of Transportation, will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) on a proposal to provide improved traffic flow along US 74 in the vicinity of Shelby. The proposed project would consist of construction of US 74 to a multi-land freeway on new location or upgrading existing US 74. The proposed highway is considered necessary to handle existing and projected traffic demand; and to provide a more direct link with full control of access between Charlotte and Asheville than that currently available via I-85 and I-26.

Alternatives under consideration include: (1) taking no action (No Build); (2) improvement of existing route (Upgrade); and (3) Northern and Southern Build alternatives and five crossovers, which combine to form 24 possible project-wide alternatives.

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments have been sent to the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and to private organizations who have previously expressed interest in this project. A series of public meetings have been held for this project: additional public meetings and a public hearing will also be held. Public notice will be given of the time and place of the meetings and hearing. The draft EIS will be made

available for public and agency review and comment.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to the proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comments and questions concerning the proposed action and the EIS should be directed to the FHWA at the address provided above.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Research, Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal progress and activities apply to this program.)

Issued on: May 2, 1996.

Roy C. Shelton,

Operations Engineer, Raleigh, North Carolina.

[FR Doc. 96-12319 Filed 5-15-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-M

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Petition for Exemption From the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Isuzu

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Grant of petition for exemption.

SUMMARY: This notice grants in full the petition of Isuzu Motors America, Inc., (Isuzu) for an exemption of a high-theft line, the Honda Acura SLX, from the parts-marking requirements of the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard. This petition is granted because the agency has determined that the antitheft device placed on the line as standard equipment is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard.

DATES: The exemption granted by this notice is effective beginning with model year (MY) 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Rosalind Proctor, Office of Planning and Consumer Programs, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, DC 20590. Ms. Proctor's telephone number is (202) 366-1740. Her fax number is (202) 493-2739.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In a letter dated February 12, 1996, Isuzu Motors America, Inc., (Isuzu), on behalf of Isuzu Motors Limited, Tokyo, Japan requested exemption from the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard (49 CFR Part 541) for the Isuzu Trooper and Honda Acura SLX vehicle

lines. The petition is pursuant to 49 CFR Part 543, Exemption From Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard, based on the installation of an antitheft device as standard equipment for the entire line.

Review of Isuzu's petition disclosed that certain information was not provided in its original petition. Consequently, by letter dated March 7, 1996, Isuzu was informed of its areas of deficiency. Additionally, the March 7 letter informed Isuzu that it must decide which of the two lines it would request to petition for exemption from the parts-marking requirements for the 1997 model year. Section 543.5(a) specifically states that "for each of model years 1997 through 2000, a manufacturer may petition NHTSA to grant an exemption for one additional line of its passenger motor vehicles from the requirements of Part 541 of this chapter." By letter dated March 27, 1996, Isuzu chose to request exemption from the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standard for the Honda Acura SLX vehicle line.

Isuzu's February 12 letter and supplemental letter of March 27, together constitute a complete petition, as required by 49 CFR Part 543.7, in that it met the general requirements contained in § 543.5 and the specific content requirements of § 543.6.

In its petition, Isuzu provided a detailed description and diagram of the identity, design, and location of the components of the antitheft device for the new line. Isuzu will install its antitheft device as standard equipment on the MY 1997 Honda Acura SLX vehicle line. This antitheft device includes an audible alarm system, a visual alarm, a starter-disconnecting device, and a locking device for the doors, tailgate and hood. Isuzu stated that the proposed antitheft device is automatically activated by the normal locking of the vehicle doors. In order to arm the device, the key must be removed from the ignition switch, all of the doors and engine hood must be closed and the driver's or front passenger's door must be locked with the ignition key. Locking either the driver's door or passenger door simultaneously locks all other doors. An indicator light within the vehicle informs the vehicle operator whether the device is armed, disarmed or alarmed.

Once armed, switches in the vehicle's doors, key cylinders and hood monitor the vehicle for unauthorized entry. Isuzu stated that all system components have been placed in inaccessible locations. If the device is armed and unauthorized entry is attempted by opening any of the doors or tailgate, or

any attempt is made to gain access to the hood compartment, the antitheft device will be triggered.

Isuzu stated that triggering the antitheft device will cause the headlights to flash and the alarm to sound. Once the alarm has been activated, the starter circuit is interrupted and the alarm horn will continue to sound for approximately three minutes. The alarm horn will shut off automatically, while the starter circuit will remain interrupted until the device is properly deactivated.

The antitheft device is deactivated by unlocking either the driver's or front passenger's door with the ignition key. Using the correct ignition key to start the vehicle will terminate the starter-interrupt mechanism and allow operation of the vehicle.

In order to ensure the reliability and durability of the device, Isuzu stated that it conducted tests based on its own specific standards. Isuzu provided a detailed list of the tests it conducted. Isuzu stated its belief that the device is reliable and durable since the device complied with Isuzu's specified requirements for each test.

Isuzu compared the antitheft device proposed for the Acura SLX with devices which NHTSA has determined to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as would compliance with the partsmarking requirements. Isuzu has stated that the antitheft device proposed for the Acura SLX line is no less effective than those antitheft devices in the lines for which NHTSA has already granted exemptions from the parts-marking requirements. Isuzu stated that the proposed device is similar to the device installed on its MYs 1987 through 1989 Impulse car line. The agency granted Isuzu a full exemption from the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standard for the Impulse car line on July 9, 1986 (51 FR 24778). Since the Isuzu Impulse car line is equipped with a similar system to that proposed for installation on the Acura SLX line, Isuzu believes that the proposed device will also be as effective in reducing and deterring theft. Isuzu stated that the antitheft device has been used as optional equipment on the Isuzu Trooper since MY 1992. According to Isuzu, the Trooper vehicle line was fully restyled and redesigned in MY 1992. Isuzu stated that 1990/1991 theft rate for the Trooper was 3.9889, and dropped to 1.4121 in MY 1992, which it believes suggests lower theft rates for later model years. Additionally, Isuzu stated that its antitheft device is similar in operation to those installed on the Mazda RX-7 and Toyota Supra car lines. Isuzu also

contends that theft data have shown a decrease in theft rates for other manufacturers' car lines when antitheft devices have been installed as standard equipment. In support of its contention, Isuzu stated that the theft rate for the Mazda RX-7 dropped from 12.11 (thefts per thousand vehicles produced) in MY 1984 to a theft rate of 6.09 in MY 1989. Theft rates for the Toyota Supra dropped from 16.3 in 1983 to 5.6 in 1987. Theft rates for the Audi 5000 fell from 2.51 in 1985 to 1.26 in 1988.

Based on evidence submitted by Isuzu, the agency believes that the antitheft device for the Honda Acura SLX vehicle line is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard (49 CFR Part 541).

The agency believes that the device will provide the types of performance listed in 49 CFR Part 543.6(a)(3): Promoting activation, attracting attention to the efforts of an unauthorized person to enter or move the vehicle by means other than a key, preventing defeat or circumvention of the device by unauthorized persons, preventing operation of the vehicle by unauthorized entrants, and ensuring the reliability and durability of the device.

As required by 49 U.S.C. 33106 and 49 CFR Part 543.6(a) (4) and (5), the agency finds that Isuzu has provided adequate reasons for its belief that the antitheft device will reduce and deter theft. This conclusion is based on the information Isuzu provided about its antitheft device. For the foregoing reasons, the agency hereby grants in full Isuzu's petition for exemption for the Honda Acura SLX vehicle line from the parts-marking requirements of 49 CFR Part 541.

If Isuzu decides not to use the exemption for this line, it must formally notify the agency, and, thereafter, mark the line according to the requirements of 49 CFR Parts 541.5 and 541.6 (marking of major component parts and replacement parts).

NHTSA notes that if Isuzu wishes to modify the device on which the exemption is based, the company may have to submit a petition to modify the exemption. Part 543.7(d) states that a Part 543 exemption applies only to vehicles that belong to a line exempted under this part and equipped with the antitheft device on which the line's exemption is based. Further, § 543.9(c)(2) provides for the submission of petitions "to modify an exemption to permit the use of an antitheft device similar to but differing from the one specified in that exemption." The

agency wishes to minimize the administrative burden with § 543.9(c)(2) could place on exempted vehicle manufacturers and itself.

The agency did not intend in drafting Part 543 to require the submission of a modification petition for every change to the components or design of an antitheft device. The significance of many such changes could be de minimis. Therefore, NHTSA suggests that if the manufacturer contemplates making any changes the effects of which might be characterized as de minimis, it should consult the agency before preparing and submitting a petition to modify.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 33106; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.

Issued on: May 13, 1996.

Barry Felrice,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 96-12342 Filed 5-15-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

Research and Special Programs Administration

[Docket PS-149]

Notice of Request for Reinstatement of an Expired Information Collection

AGENCY: Research and Special Programs Administration, DOT.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the Research and Special Programs Administration's (RSPA) intention to request reinstatement of an information collection in support of the Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS) for Response Plans for Onshore Oil Pipelines.

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received by July 15, 1996 to be assured of consideration.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Marvin Fell, Office of Pipeline Safety, Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20950, (202) 366-1640.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Response Plans for Onshore Oil Pipelines.

OMB Number: 2137-0589.

Type of Request: Reinstatement of an information collection. **Abstract:** The Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA 90) requires that certain pipelines that transport oil must develop a response plan to minimize the impact of an oil discharge in the case of an accident. These response plans enhance the spill

response capability of pipeline operators.

Estimate of Burden: The average burden hours per response is 120.

Respondents: Oil Pipeline operators.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1,215.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 140,300 hours.

Frequency: Every three years.

Use: To enhance response capability in the event of an oil spill.

Copies of this information collection can be reviewed at the Dockets Unit, Room 8421, Research and Special Programs Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590.

Comments are invited on: (a) The need for the proposed collection of information for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques. Send comments to Marvin Fell, OPS, RSPA, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590.

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also be a matter of public record.

Issued in Washington, DC on May 8, 1996. Richard B. Felder,

Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.

[FR Doc. 96-12233 Filed 5-15-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-P

Surface Transportation Board¹

[STB Finance Docket No. 32940]

Buffalo & Pittsburgh Railroad, Inc.—Trackage Rights Exemption—Pittsburg & Shawmut Railroad, Inc. [19490]

Pittsburg & Shawmut Railroad, Inc. has agreed to grant local trackage rights

¹ The ICC Termination Act of 1995, Pub. L. No. 104-88, 109 Stat. 803, which was enacted on December 29, 1995, and took effect on January 1, 1996, abolished the Interstate Commerce Commission and transferred certain functions to the Surface Transportation Board (Board). This notice relates to functions that are subject to Board jurisdiction pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 11323-24.

to Buffalo & Pittsburgh Railroad, Inc. over approximately 1.5 miles of railroad located in Pennsylvania between milepost 1.5 near Dellwood Junction and milepost 0.00 at Brockway Yard. The trackage rights were to become effective on or after May 10, 1996.

This notice is filed under 49 CFR 1180.2(d)(7). If the notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio*. Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of a petition to revoke will not stay the transaction.

An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to STB Finance Docket No. 32940, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board, Office of the Secretary, Case Control Branch, 1201 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20423 and served on: James B. Gray, Jr., Harter, Secrest & Emery, 700 Midtown Tower, Rochester, NY 14604-2070.

Under 49 U.S.C. 10502(g), the Board may not use its exemption authority to relieve a rail carrier of its statutory obligation to protect the interests of its employees. Section 11326(c), however, does not provide for labor protection for transactions under sections 11324 and 11325 that involve only Class III rail carriers. Because this transaction involves Class III rail carriers only, the Board, under the statute, may not impose labor protective conditions for this transaction.

Decided: May 10, 1996.

By the Board, David M. Konschnik, Director, Office of Proceedings.

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-12278 Filed 5-15-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915-00-P

Surface Transportation Board¹

[STB Finance Docket No. 32939]

Pittsburg & Shawmut Railroad, Inc.—Trackage Rights Exemption—Buffalo & Pittsburgh Railroad, Inc. [19489]

Buffalo & Pittsburgh Railroad, Inc. has agreed to grant overhead trackage rights to Pittsburg & Shawmut Railroad, Inc. over approximately 13 miles of railroad located in Pennsylvania between milepost 204.0 near Falls Creek Junction and milepost 191.0 at Forest. The

¹ The ICC Termination Act of 1995, Pub. L. No. 104-88, 109 Stat. 803, which was enacted on December 29, 1995, and took effect on January 1, 1996, abolished the Interstate Commerce Commission and transferred certain functions to the Surface Transportation Board (Board). This notice relates to functions that are subject to Board jurisdiction pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 11323-24.