acting as an employer but instead was acting as GSA's ''building manager'' when it denied NTEU's request for a permit, then what, if any, would be the effect of Authority precedent holding that a non-employer agency can be found to have interfered with protected rights on the issue of whether SSA violated the Statute? See Headquarters, Defense Logistics Agency, Washington, D.C., 22 FLRA 875, 883–84 (1986).

2. Is it relevant and, if so, how is it relevant whether non-labor organizations have been granted access to the areas for which NTEU sought the permit?

3. Is it relevant and, if so, how is it relevant that the ''facilities'' to which NTEU sought access were external, quasi-public areas?

4. If GSA were the employing agency at the Woodlawn complex and NTEU were seeking a permit for purposes of organizing GSA employees, how would the Constitutional concerns identified by the court be avoided by the ''facilities'' analysis it suggested?

5. The Authority, relying on the ruling announced in Department of the Army, United States Army Natick Laboratories, Natick, Mass., 3 A/SLMR 193 (1973) (Natick), has interpreted section 7116(a)(3) as prohibiting an agency from allowing a rival union, lacking equivalent status to an incumbent labor organization, access to the agency's facilities and services. How and why would such access always constitute unlawful sponsorship, control, or assistance under section 7116(a)(3)?

6. Is the approach used by the predecessor to the Authority, the Federal Labor Relations Council, to resolve similar issues under Executive Order 11491, as amended, more consistent with the Statute than the approach set forth in Natick? The Council's approach analyzed whether the agency conduct constituted control of, or interference with a union's independence. See Grissom AFB, 6 FLRC 406 (1978).

7. Is the portion of section 7116(a)(3) that refers to furnishing customary and routine services and facilities an exception to the prohibition on sponsorship, control, or assistance of a labor organization or are there any situations where it creates a requirement that such services and facilities be furnished? For example, in order to avoid ''sponsoring'' an incumbent labor organization, would an agency be required under any circumstances to furnish ordinary facilities and services to a rival?

8. What meaning should be attributed to the phrase ''having equivalent status'' in section 7116(a)(3)?

a. Should this term be applied differently depending upon whether the employees in the agency from whom assistance is sought are represented by a labor organization?

b. Does an agency violate section 7116(a)(3) by furnishing, or failing to furnish, facilities and services to all nonincumbent labor organizations on an impartial basis?

c. Should the Authority reconsider its precedent that ''a petitioning union acquires equivalent status for the purposes of section 7116(a)(3) when an appropriate Regional Director determines, and notifies the parties, that the petition includes a prima facie showing of interest and merits further processing[]''? U.S. Department of Defense Dependents School, Panama Region, 44 FLRA 419, 425 (1992).

9. If the Authority were to conclude on remand that section 7116(a)(3) did not require SSA to reject NTEU's request for a permit, would:

a. Section 7116(a)(3) require that SSA grant NTEU's permit request?

b. SSA's denial of the permit to NTEU's non-employee organizers violate 5 U.S.C. 7116(a)(1)?

c. it result in manifest injustice to hold SSA liable for a violation of either section 7116(a)(3) or section 7116(a)(1) based on approaches not previously articulated?

Dated: May 20, 1996.

For the Authority.

James H. Adams,

Acting Director, Case Control Office.

[FR Doc. 96–13043 Filed 5–22–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6727–01–P

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

[Docket No. 96–11]

Haewoo Air & Shipping Co., Ltd. (d/b/a Haewoo Shipping Co., Ltd.); Possible Violations of Section 10(b)(1) of the Shipping Act of 1984; Order of Investigation

Haewoo Air & Shipping Co., Ltd. d/b/a Haewoo Shipping Co., Ltd. (''Haewoo'') is a non-vessel-operating common carrier located in Seoul, Korea. Haewoo maintains a tariff on file with the Commission which provides for service between various Asian countries and the United States.

A review of Haewoo's tariff showed that it contained only one commodity rate in addition to Cargo, N.O.S. rates. A review of invoices and freight payments for shipments moving under Haewoo bills of lading from June 5, 1994, to January 19, 1995, indicated that Haewoo did not charge the rates contained in its tariff. On February 3, 1995, additional commodity rates were filed by Haewoo in its tariff.

Section 10(b)(1) of the Shipping Act of 1984 (''1984 Act''), 46 U.S.C. app. 1709(b)(1), provides that no common carrier may charge, demand, collect, or receive greater, less, or different compensation for the transportation of property or for any service in connection therewith than the rates and charges in its tariffs. In regard to the activities of Haewoo, it appears that Haewoo charged less than its applicable tariff rates for the transportation of at least 36 shipments between June 5, 1994, and January 19, 1995, in violation of section 10(b)(1) of the 1984 Act.

Section 11 of the 1984 Act, 46 U.S.C. app. 1710, sets forth the Commission's authority to investigate violations of the 1984 Act. In the event violations are found, section 13 of the 1984 Act, 46 U.S.C. app. 1712, provides that the Commission may assess civil penalties and suspend tariffs as remedies for violations of section 10(b)(1). Section 14(a) of the 1984 Act, 46 U.S.C. app. 1713(a), empowers the Commission to issue orders relating to violations of the 1984 Act.

Now therefore it is ordered, that pursuant to sections 10, 11, 13 and 14 of the 1984 Act, an investigation is hereby instituted to determine:

1. Whether Haewoo violated section 10(b)(1) of the 1984 Act by charging, demanding, collecting, or receiving greater, lesser, or different compensation for the transportation of property or for any service in connection therewith than the rates and charges that are shown in its tariffs;

2. Whether, in the event Haewoo violated the 1984 Act, civil penalties should be assessed against Haewoo and, if so, the amount of such penalties;

3. Whether, in the event violations are found, an appropriate cease and desist order should be issued; and

4. Whether, in the event violations are found, Haewoo's tariff should be suspended for a period of time not to exceed 12 months.

It is further ordered, That a public hearing be held in this proceeding and that this matter be assigned for hearing before an Administrative Law Judge (''Presiding Officer'') of the Commission's Office of Administrative Law Judges in compliance with Rule 61 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 46 CFR 502.61. The Hearing shall include oral testimony and cross-examination at the discretion of the Presiding Officer only after consideration has been given by the parties and the Presiding Officer to the use of alternative forms of dispute

resolution, and upon proper showing that there are genuine issues of material fact that cannot be resolved on the basis of sworn statements, affidavits, depositions, or other documents or that the nature of the matter in issue is such that an oral hearing and cross-examination are necessary for the development of an adequate record.

It is further ordered, That Haewoo Air & Shipping Co., Ltd. d/b/a Haewoo Shipping Co., Ltd. is designated Respondent in this proceeding;

It is further ordered, That the Commission's Bureau of Enforcement is designated a party to this proceeding;

It is further ordered, That notice of this Order be published in the Federal Register, and a copy be served on parties of record;

It is further ordered, That other persons having an interest in participating in this proceeding may file petitions for leave to intervene in accordance with Rule 72 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 46 CFR 502.72;

It is further ordered, That all further notices, orders, and/or decisions issued by or on behalf of the Commission in this proceeding, including notice of the time and place of hearing or prehearing conference, shall be served on parties of record;

It is further ordered, That all documents submitted by any party of record in this proceeding shall be directed to the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, D.C. 20573, and comply with Subpart H of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 46 CFR 502.111–119, and shall be served on parties of record; and

It is further ordered, That in accordance with Rule 61 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 46 CFR 502.61, the initial decision of the Administrative Law Judge shall be issued by January 20, 1997, and the final decision of the Commission shall be issued by May 20, 1997.

By the Commission.

Joseph C. Polking,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–13056 Filed 5–22–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730–01–M

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board; Meeting

AGENCY: General Accounting Office.

ACTION: Notice of Meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. No. 92–463), as amended, notice is hereby given that the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board will meet on Thursday, May 30, 1996, from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. in room 7C13 of the General Accounting Office, 441 G St., NW., Washington, DC.

The purpose of the meeting is to discuss and review the (1) *Accounting for Natural Resources* document, (2) JFMIP Cost Accounting Systems and Reporting project, (3) *Invitation for Views: Accounting for the cost of Capital* document, and (4) Rule 203 of the AICPA's Code of Ethics.

Any interested person may attend the meeting as an observer. Board discussions and reviews are open to the public.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ronald S. Young, Executive Staff Director, 750 First St., NE., Room 1001, Washington, DC. 20002, or call (202) 512–7350.

Authority: Federal Advisory Committee Act. Pub. L. No. 92–463, section 10(a)(2), 86 Stat. 770, 774 (1972) (current version at 5 U.S.C. app. section 10(a)(2) (1988); 41 CFR 101–6.1015 (1990).

Dated: May 20, 1996.

[FR Doc. 96–13040 Filed 5–22–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1610–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Health Care Financing Administration

[HCFA 317]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

In compliance with the requirement of section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Health and Care Financing Administration (HCFA), Department of Health and Human Services, has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) the following proposals for the collection of information. Interested persons are invited to send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including any of the following subjects: (1) The necessity and utility of the proposed information collection for the proper performance of the agency's functions; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology to minimize the information collection burden.

1. *Type of Request:* Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired; *Title of Information Collection:* State Medicaid Eligibility Quality Control Sampling Plan; *Form No.:* HCFA–317; *Use:* The State MEQC sampling plan is necessary for HCFA to monitor the States' operation of the MEQC system. The sampling plan includes all data involved in the States' sample selection process—population sizes and sample frame lists, sample sizes, sample selection procedures, and claims collection procedures; *Frequency:* Annually; *Affected Public:* State, local, or tribal government; *Number of Respondents:* 55; *Total Annual Responses:* 110; *Total Annual Hours:* 2,640.

To request copies of the proposed paperwork collection referenced above, E-mail your request, including your address, to Paperwork@hcfa.gov, or call the Reports Clearance Office on (410) 786–1326. Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collections should be sent within 60 days of this notice directly to the HCFA Paperwork Clearance Officer designated at the following address: OMB Human Resources and Housing Branch, Attention: Allison Eydt, New Executive Office Building, Room 10235, Washington, D.C. 20503.

Dated: May 16, 1996.

Kathleen B. Larson,

Director, Management Planning and Analysis Staff, Office of Financial and Human Resources, Health Care Financing Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–12962 Filed 5–22–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4120–03–P

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry

[ATSDR–110]

Minimal Risk Levels for Priority Substances and Guidance for Derivation

AGENCY: Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) (42 U.S.C. 9604 et seq.), as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) (Pub. L. 99–499), requires that