

There have also been considerable arguments that the automatic seat belt system, *as utilized*, only gives an appearance of protection. Many occupants of the passenger seat will not use the manual lap belt, and thus only be protected by the automatic torso belt. In a crash, the protection offered by this two-point system is questionable.

The automatic belts may also be attached to the door. In a crash, the door latch may fail, yielding no protection at all to the passenger.

The passive restraint requirement went into effect when too few states adopted mandatory seat belt laws. These laws have now been adopted in all states but one. All of the affected vehicles were sold in mandatory seat belt usage states. It is against the law in these states to be unbelted. The installation of an automatic seat belt would therefore be redundant, since the passengers are required to be belted.

The subject vehicles are 1994 and 1995 model year vehicles. Therefore, they are at least four years old and have completed at least half of their useful life. This greatly reduces the addition to safety, that might result from the installation of passenger side passive restraints.

For these reasons, the installation of a passive restraint in these few vehicles involved will not result in a significant addition to vehicle safety.

To the best of the importers' knowledge, there have been no accidents, injuries, fatalities, or warranty claims related to the noncompliance.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments on the petition described above. Comments should refer to the Docket Number and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. It is requested that two 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 practicable. 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: March 13, 2000.
(49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 49 CFR 501.8)

Issued on: February 7, 2000.

Stephen R. Kratzke,
Acting Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 00-3193 Filed 2-10-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[Section 5a Application No. 61 (Sub-No. 6)]

National Classification Committee—Agreement

AGENCY: Surface Transportation Board.

ACTION: Request for proposals and comments.

SUMMARY: The Surface Transportation Board (Board) seeks suggested methodologies for increasing shipper participation in the classification process, as required by the Board's decisions in *National Classification Committee—Agreement*, Section 5a Application No. 61 (STB served Dec. 18, 1998, and February 11, 2000).

DATES: Opening proposals and comments are due April 11, 2000. Reply comments are due May 11, 2000.

Rebuttals are due June 12, 2000.¹

ADDRESSES: Send an original and 10 copies of proposals, comments, and replies, referring to "Section 5a Application No. 61 (Sub-No. 6)" to: Surface Transportation Board, Office of the Secretary, Case Control Unit, 1925 K Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20423.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph H. Dettmar, (202) 565-1600.

[TDD for the hearing impaired: 1-800-877-8339.]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Additional information is contained in the Board's decisions, which are available on the Board's website at "WWW.STB.DOT.GOV".

Decided: February 4, 2000.

By the Board, Chairman Morgan, Vice Chairman Burkes, and Commissioner Clyburn.

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-3239 Filed 2-10-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915-00-P

¹ Arguing that the instant proceeding is essentially an investigation, NCC has filed a motion, to which replies were filed by The National Industrial Transportation League and by the Health and Personal Care Distribution Conference, Inc. and National Small Shipments Traffic Conference, Inc., asking for a procedural schedule under which it will be permitted to open and close the record. We understand why NCC might want to open and close in order to seek to limit the debate to whatever proposal it decides to file at the outset. But we have already held extensive proceedings, in which NCC has made several filings, and in which we have already determined that NCC's procedures should be modified. As a result, we believe that parties in addition to NCC should have an opportunity to present their proposals as an initial matter. We are, however, providing all parties with an opportunity to respond to any initial proposals or comments made, and we are providing each party that makes an initial filing with a further opportunity to present rebuttal evidence and argument in response to any comments addressing its initial filing.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[Section 5a Application No. 1 (Sub-No. 10)]

Household Goods Carriers Bureau Committee—Agreement

AGENCY: Surface Transportation Board.

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Surface Transportation Board (Board) requests comments on whether approval of the rate bureau agreement of the Household Goods Carriers Bureau Committee (HGB) ought to be conditioned on reductions in "benchmark" rates to prevailing levels of market based rates.

DATES: Comments are due by March 27, 2000; replies are due March 13, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Send an original and 10 copies of comments and replies, referring to "Section 5a Application No. 1 (Sub-No. 10)" to: Surface Transportation Board, Office of the Secretary, Case Control Unit, 1925 K Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20423.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Joseph H. Dettmar, (202) 565-1600.

[TDD for the hearing impaired: 1-800-877-8339.]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In our decisions in *EC-MAC Motor Carriers Service Association, Inc., et al.*, Sec. 5a Application No. 118 (Amendment No. 1), *et al.* (STB served Dec. 18, 1998, and February 11, 2000) (*EC-MAC*) (which are available on the Board's website at "WWW.STB.DOT.GOV"), we conditioned renewal of motor carrier rate bureau agreements under 49 U.S.C. 13703 on reductions of collective rates to prevailing competitive rate levels. In its renewal application, HGB does not address how the concerns expressed in *EC-MAC* apply to the traffic carried by its members. It does, however, appear to us that HGB serves as a forum in which members collectively set benchmark rates, from which the actual rates paid by many householders are discounted. Therefore, before acting on HGB's application, we are seeking comment on whether any immunity granted to HGB ought to be conditioned on reductions in benchmark rates to prevailing levels of market based rates and, if so, methodologies that can be used to adjust the collectively set rates to market-based levels.

Decided: February 4, 2000.