Commission approval before substituting the securities held by the trust. Section 26(b) also states that the Commission shall issue an order approving such substitution if the evidence establishes that it is consistent with the protection of investors and the purposes fairly intended by the policy and provisions of the 1940 Act.

3. The Contract expressly reserves to the depositor (originally WM Life) the right, subject to compliance with applicable law, to substitute shares of another open-end registered investment company for shares of an open-end registered investment company held by a subaccount of the separate account. Applicants represent that the statement of additional information for the Contract and the SAFECO Account contains appropriate disclosure of this right.

4. This right of substitution was reserved to protect the depositor and the Contract owners in situations where either might be harmed or disadvantaged by circumstances surrounding the issuer of the shares held by one or more of the depositor's separate accounts, and to afford the opportunity to replace such shares where to do so could benefit the depositor and Contract owners.

5. Applicants represent that the Trust's Growth Portfolio, Northwest Portfolio, and Bond Portfolio are each suitable and appropriate investment vehicles for Contract owners. The investment objectives of each of the Trust Portfolios involved in the substitution are substantially similar to the investment objectives of the corresponding Composite Fund Portfolio.

6. Applicants anticipate that Contract owners will be at least as well off with the proposed array of investment options offered after the proposed substitutions as they have been with the array of investment options offered prior to the substitutions. The proposed substitutions retain investment flexibility for Contract owners, which is a central feature of the Contracts. All Contract owners will be permitted to allocate purchase payments to and transfer Contract values among and between the same number of investment subaccounts (with substantially the same investment objectives) as they could before the proposed substitutions.

7. Applicants assert that none of the proposed substitutions is the type of substitution which Section 26(b) was designed to prevent. Unlike traditional unit investment trusts where a depositor could only substitute an investment security in a manner which permanently affected all the investors in the trust, the Contract provides each Contract owner with the right to exercise his or her own judgment and transfer account values into other investment subaccounts. Moreover, SAFECO will offer Contract owners the opportunity to transfer amounts out of the affected subaccounts into any of the remaining subaccounts without cost or other disadvantage. The proposed substitutions, therefore will not result in the type of costly forced redemption which Section 26(b) was designed to prevent.

8. In addition, the proposed substitutions are unlike the type of substitution which Section 26(b) was designed to prevent in that by purchasing a Contract, Contract owners select much more than a particular investment company in which to invest their Contract values. They also select the specific type of insurance coverage offered under their Contract as well as numerous other rights and privileges set forth in the Contract. Contract owners may also have considered the depositor's size, financial condition, type and its reputation for service in selecting their Contract. None of these factors will diminish as a result of the proposed substitutions.

9. Finally, whereas the assets of the Composite Fund can be expected to remain stagnant or decline since no new Contracts are being sold, the proposed substitutions will allow Contract owners to participate in mutual fund portfolios that are being actively sold through other separate accounts, and therefore the assets of the Trust are likely to increase.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that, for all the reasons stated above, the proposed substitutions are consistent with the protection of investors and the purposes fairly intended by the policy and provisions of the 1940 Act.

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

Jonathan G. Katz,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–32212 Filed 12–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

[USCG–1999–6605]

Secretarial Authorization for Certain Members and Employees of the U.S. Coast Guard to Serve on the Board of Control, Coast Guard Mutual Assistance

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commandant of the Coast Guard, exercising authority delegated by the Secretary of Transportation, has authorized certain military members and employees to serve, without compensation, on the Board of Control of Coast Guard Mutual Assistance, a non-federal military-welfare entity. He has so authorized them for the purpose of providing coordination, oversight, and advice to the management of the Coast Guard's Mutual Assistance Program. Participation of the designated officials in the activities of Coast Guard Mutual Assistance will not extend to participation in day-to-day operations.

DISCUSSION: The Secretary of Transportation, through the Commandant, has authorized the following members and employees of the Coast Guard to serve, without compensation, on the Board of Control of Coast Guard Mutual Assistance (see 10 U.S.C. 1033 and 1589). *Officers:* Commandant of the Coast Guard, Admiral James M. Loy, USCG (President); Assistant Commandant for Human Resources, Rear Admiral Fred L. Ames, USCG (Executive Vice President); Captain James E. Evans, USCG (Second Vice President); Lieutenant Commander Barry A. Compagnoni, USCG (Treasurer); Chief Warrant Officer Roberto Ruiz, USCG (Secretary). *Members:* Commander James D. Bjostad, USCG (Commissioned Officer); Lieutenant Commander Barry A. Compagnoni, USCG (Commissioned Officer); Chief Warrant Officer Robert H. Gitschier, USCG (RET), (Retired Member); Master Chief Petty Officer Vincent W. Patton, USCG (Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard); Master Chief Petty Officer Mark A. Lewack, USCG (Enlisted, E–7 or above); Petty Officer First Class Petra A. Wolford, USCG (Enlisted, E–6 or below); Petty Officer First Class Scott C. Tull, USCG (Enlisted, E–6 or below); Ms. Maureen Melton (Civilian employee); Mrs. Jennifer Rechsteiner (Civilian employee); Lieutenant Commander Charles E. Martin, USCG (RET) (USCG Auxiliary); Captain Francis C. Buckley, USCG (Reserve); Chief Warrant Officer

Roberto Ruiz, USCG (Medical and TRICARE Specialist); Captain Ruth I. Torres, USPHS (Family Support Specialist); Chief Petty Officer Trudy D. Douglas, USCG (Alternate: MCPO–CG); Chief Petty Officer Keith W. Denman, USCG (Alternate: CPO); Petty Officer First Class Marion L. White, USCG (Alternate: Enlisted, E–6 or below).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information concerning this notice, contact Mr. Carl Mursh, Coast Guard Mutual Assistance, (202) 267–1682.

[**Authority:** 10 U.S.C. 1033 and 1589; 49 CFR 1.47(ooo)]

Dated: December 2, 1999.

F.L. Ames,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Assistant Commandant for Human Resources.

[FR Doc. 99–32201 Filed 12–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Communications/Surveillance Operational Implementation Team (C/SOIT) Hosted Forum on the Operational Implementation of Satellite Communications and Data Link Technologies for Aviation Applications in the National Airspace System (NAS)

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Meeting.

SUMMARY: The FAA C/SOIT will be hosting a 3-day public forum to discuss the FAA's Controller-Pilot Data Link Communication (CPDLC) program. Formal presentations will be provided followed by a question and answer session. Working group sessions will be held to discuss acceptable programs and requirements for CPDLC training and approval and operational implementation of CPDLC and High Frequency Data Link (HFDL). Those who plan to attend are invited to submit proposed discussion topics. Requests to make presentations to the assembled forum should be made to the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** listed.

DATES: January 11–13, 2000, 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: Holiday Inn Rosslyn WestPark Hotel, 1900 Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, VA, Telephone (703) 807–2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Registration and submission of suggested discussion topics may be made to Ms. Dottie Wilkins, telephone (202) 484–2535, fax (202) 484–1510 or email at dottie.ctr.wilkins@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Open to the aviation industry with attendance limited to space available. Participants are required to register their intent to attend this meeting by December 10, 1999. Names, affiliations, addresses, telephone and facsimile numbers should be sent to the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Issued in Washington, DC, on December 9, 1999.

Donald W. Streeter,

C/SOIT Co-Chairman.

[FR Doc. 99–32109 Filed 12–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) Approvals and Disapprovals

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Monthly Notice of PFC Approvals and Disapprovals. In November 1999, there were seven applications approved. This notice also includes information on two applications, one approved in February 1999 and the other approved in June 1999, inadvertently left off the February 1999 and June 1999 notices, respectively. Additionally, nine approved amendments to previously approved applications are listed.

SUMMARY: The FAA publishes a monthly notice, as appropriate, of PFC approvals and disapprovals under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Pub. L. 101–508) and part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158). This notice is published pursuant to paragraph d of § 158.29.

PFC Applications Approved

Public Agency: Duluth Airport Authority, Duluth, Minnesota.

Application Number: 99–03–C–00–DLH.

Application Type: Impose and use a PFC.

PFC Level: $3.00.

Total PFC Revenue Approved in this Decision: $561,879.

Earliest Charge Effective Date: May 1, 1999.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: July 1, 2001.

Class of Air Carrier Not Required To Collect PFC's: Non-scheduled Part 135 air taxi/commercial operators.

Determination: Approved. Based on information contained in the public agency's application, the FAA has determined that the approved class accounts for less than 1 percent of the total annual enplanements at Duluth International Airport (DLH).

Brief Description of Projects Approved for Collection at DLH and Use at DLH:

Acquire snow removal equipment.

Develop airport noise overlay zone.

Energy improvements to terminal building heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system.

PFC consultation fees.

Brief Description of Project Partially Approved for Collection at DLH and Use at Duluth Sky Harbor Airport:

Safety/security improvements.

Determination: Partially approved. The installation of security cameras and a card operated vehicle gate and door are determined to be ineligible under paragraphs 563 and 569(c) of FAA Order 5100.38A, Airport Improvement Program (AIP) Handbook (October 24, 1989). In addition, the acquisition of a 14-foot rescue/recovery boat is determined to be ineligible in accordance with paragraph 562(d) of FAA Order 5100.38A, AIP Handbook (October 24, 1989).

Decision Date: February 2, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gordon Nelson, Minneapolis Airport district Office, (612) 713–4358.

Public Agency: MBS International Airport Commission, Saginaw, Michigan.

Application Number: 99–03–C–00–MBS.

Application Type: Impose and use a PFC.

PFC Level: $3:00.

Total PFC Revenue Approved in this Decision: $4,234,047.

Earliest Charge Effective Date: January 1, 2000.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: September 1, 2005.

Class of Air Carrier Not Required To Collect PFC's:

Part 135 air taxi/commercial operators filing FAA Form 1800–31.

Determination: Approved. Based on information contained in the public agency's application, the FAA has determined that the approved class accounts for less than 1 percent of the total annual enplanements at MBS International Airport.

Brief Description of Projects Approved for Collection And Use:

Acquire snow removal equipment (plow truck with sand spreader).

Improve airport drainage (phase I).

Replace primary underground conduit (telephone and electrical).

PFC application preparation.

Year 2000 computer testing.