

Regional Airport of the Valdosta-Lowndes County Airport Authority at the following address: Mr. Richard R. Clark, Executive Director, Valdosta Regional Airport, 2626 Madison Highway, Valdosta, Georgia 31601.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the Valdosta-Lowndes County Airport Authority under section 158.23 of Part 158.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Atlanta Airports District Office, Mr. Walter Bauer, Program Manager, 1701 Columbia Avenue, Suite 2-206, Atlanta, Georgia, 30337-2747, telephone (404) 305-7142.

The application may be reviewed in person at this same location.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to use the revenue from a PFC at Valdosta Regional Airport 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).

On April 17, 1997, the FAA determined that the application to use the revenue from the PFC submitted by Valdosta-Lowndes County Regional Airport was substantially complete within the requirements of section 158.25 of Part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than July 24, 1997. The following is a brief overview of the application.

*Level of the proposed PFC:* \$3.00.

*Proposed charge effective date:* March 1, 1993.

*Proposed charge expiration date:* September 30, 1997.

*Total estimated PFC revenue:* \$307,746.

*Application number:* 97-02-U-00-VLD.

*Brief description of proposed project(s):*

New Terminal Building Construction. Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: AV Atlantic, Miami Air International, and Viscount Air Service, Inc.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Valdosta-Lowndes County Airport Authority.

Issued in College Park, Georgia on April 17, 1997.

**Dell T. Jernigan,**

*Manager, Atlanta Airports District Office, Southern Region.*

[FR Doc. 97-10666 Filed 4-23-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Railroad Administration

[FRA Docket No. LI-96-4]

#### Petition for Extension of Waiver of Compliance

In accordance with Part 211 of Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), notice is hereby given that the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) received a request for an extension of a waiver of compliance with certain requirements of its safety standards. The individual petition is described below, including the party seeking relief, the regulatory provisions involved, the nature of the relief being requested, and the petitioner's arguments in favor of relief.

#### Boone & Scenic Valley Railroad

Waiver Petition Docket Number: LI-96-4

The Boone & Scenic Valley Railroad (BSV) seeks a one year conditional extension waiver of compliance from certain sections of Title 49 CFR Part 230.23, *Locomotive Inspection—Method of Testing Flexible Staybolts with Caps*, for its steam locomotive JS 8419, built in China in 1989. It weighs 418,210 pounds, including the tender, and has 56,770 pounds tractive effort. This is a coal burning boiler equipped with a stoker. The boiler has 80-2 inch diameter flues and 50-5¼ inch diameter superheater flues.

Locomotive JS 8419 was purchased new by BSV and has been used only by BSV in tourist train service. This locomotive has travelled an estimated 12,600 miles since being placed in service in May 1990. The boiler staybolts are welded in place.

BSV has been granted a conditional waiver, Docket No. LI-92-3, to operate locomotive JS 8419 in compliance with 49 CFR Section 229.31 in lieu of 49 CFR Section 230.108 for the main reservoirs. In December 1992, BSV requested FRA to allow it to extend the time interval for the removal of the caps and examination of the flexible staybolts from two years as required by Section 230.23 of the steam locomotive inspection rules to five years. This is the first one year extension request for the removal of caps from flexible staybolts. The last removal of the caps was done in May

1994. No broken flexible staybolts were found during the last inspection.

The inspection of the fire box, smoke box, boiler interior and exterior, locomotive running gear, and tender show no obvious deficiencies or defects. No vandalism has been reported.

Interested parties are invited to participate in these proceedings by submitting written views, data, or comments. FRA does not anticipate scheduling a public hearing in connection with these proceedings since the facts do not appear to warrant a hearing. If any interested party desires an opportunity for oral comment, they should notify FRA, in writing, before the end of the comment period and specify the basis for their request.

All communications concerning these proceedings should identify the appropriate docket number (e.g., Waiver Petition Docket Number LI-96-4) and must be submitted in triplicate to the Docket Clerk, Office of Chief Counsel, FRA, Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. Communications received within 45 days of the date of this notice will be considered by FRA before final action is taken. Comments received after that date will be considered as far as practicable. All written communications concerning these proceedings are available for examination during regular business hours (9 a.m.-5 p.m.) at FRA's temporary docket room located at 1120 Vermont Avenue, NW, Room 7051, Washington, DC 20005.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on March 31, 1997.

**Phil Olekszyk,**

*Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Compliance and Program Implementation.*

[FR Doc. 97-10626 Filed 4-23-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-06-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

#### Petition for Modification of Exemption From the Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; General Motors Corporation

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

**ACTION:** Grant of petition for modification of a previously approved anti-theft device.

**SUMMARY:** On February 19, 1993, this agency granted in part General Motors Corporation's (GM) petition for exemption from the parts-marking requirements of the vehicle theft

prevention standard for the Cadillac Seville car line. This notice grants in full GM's petition for modification of the previously approved antitheft device for that line. The agency grants this petition because it has determined, based on substantial evidence, that the modified antitheft device described in GM's petition to be placed on the car line as standard equipment, is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements.

**DATES:** The exemption granted by this notice is effective beginning with model year (MY) 1998.

**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) 366-0846. Her fax number is (202) 493-2739.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In February 1993, NHTSA published in the **Federal Register** a notice granting in part the petition from General Motors Corporation (GM) for an exemption from the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard (49 CFR Part 541) for the model year 1994 Cadillac Seville car line. (See 58 FR 11659, February 26, 1993). The agency determined that the "PASS-Key II" antitheft device, which GM intended to install on the Cadillac Seville car line as standard equipment, was likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as would compliance with the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard. The agency decided based on the information available at that time that a full exemption was not appropriate and granted a partial exemption which required that the engine and transmission on this line continue to be marked. The agency limited the exemption because the antitheft device lacked both an audible and visual alarm to call attention to unauthorized entry of the vehicle. The lack of such a warning device made the agency uncertain whether the device would be as effective as parts marking in deterring theft of this vehicle.

On January 16, 1997, GM submitted its petition for modification to its previously approved "PASS-Key II" antitheft device. The petition also asked that the line be granted a full rather than partial exemption. GM's submittal is considered a complete petition, as required by 49 CFR Part 543.9(d), in that it meets the general requirements contained in § 543.5 and the specific content requirements of § 543.6. GM requested confidential treatment for

some of the information and attachments submitted in support of its petition for modification. In a letter to GM dated March 12, 1997, the agency granted the petitioner's request for confidential treatment.

In its petition for MY 1994, GM included a detailed description of the identity, design and location of the components of the "PASS-Key II" antitheft device, including diagrams of components and their location in the vehicle. GM described the "PASS-Key II" antitheft device installed as standard equipment as passively activated. The "PASS-Key II" antitheft device utilizes an ignition key, an ignition lock cylinder and a decoder module.

GM stated that for MY 1998, the "PASS-Key III" antitheft device will utilize more advanced technology than the "PASS-Key" or "PASS-Key II" devices. The "PASS-Key III" device will add new features and refinements to some of the previous "PASS-Key/PASS-Key II" components. As with the "PASS-Key" and "PASS-Key II" antitheft devices, the "PASS-Key III" device will remain fully functional once the ignition has been turned off and the key has been removed. No operator action will be required other than removing the key. The "PASS-Key III" will also use a special ignition key and decoder module. The conventional mechanical key unlocks and releases the steering wheel and transmission lever. However, before the vehicle can be operated, the key's electrical code must be sensed by the key cylinder and properly decoded by the decoder module.

GM stated that the transponder, now embedded in the head of the key for the "PASS-Key III" device, is stimulated by a coil surrounding the key cylinder. The transponder in the key then emits a modulated signal at a specified radio frequency. The identity of the key is an integral and unique code within the modulated signal. The "PASS-Key III" device has the potential for four trillion or more unique electrical key codes. The key cylinder coil receives and sends the modulated signal to the decoder. When the decoder module recognizes a valid key code, it sends an encoded message to the Powertrain Control Module (PCM) to enable fuel flow and starter operation. If an invalid key is detected, the "PASS-Key III" decoder module will transmit a different password to the PCM to disable fuel flow and starter operation.

The "PASS-Key II" device was designed to shut down for three to four minutes if an invalid key was detected, preventing further attempts at starting the vehicle during that shutdown. However, GM believes that the time-

consuming task of attempting to defeat a device having over four trillion key codes by a trial-and-error method eliminates the need for such an extensive shutdown period. Therefore, with the "PASS-Key III" device, a shutdown period occurs only if someone is attempting to program a new electronically coded key. Shut-down occurs for ten seconds with a valid key and thirty minutes with a non-valid key. As an additional security measure, GM will provide the MY 1998 Cadillac Seville owner/operator with a "valet" version of the "PASS-Key III" ignition key that will be modified to prevent the ten-second code-duplication possible with the normal ignition key.

The "PASS-Key III" antenna will be located in the ignition switch assembly, and the decoder module will be mounted behind the instrument panel for MY 1998. GM stated that the device cannot be defeated by removing and then subsequently reapplying vehicle power. Additionally, GM stated that replacement of the decoder module will not defeat the device because of its decoder module password.

Upon starting the vehicle, the ignition switch will enable power to the "PASS-Key III" device causing the decoder module to illuminate a "security" light on the instrument cluster. GM states that this "bulb check" sequence will last for five seconds and then the light will return to the normal state ("off") for a valid key. Any attempts to start the vehicle with an electronically invalid key will cause the "security" light to turn on. Should an error arise during normal operation, the "security" light is enabled, signaling to the operator that a fault has been detected in the "PASS-Key III" device. According to GM, the vehicle will continue to operate despite the fault, however, vehicle security may be compromised.

GM stated that the "PASS-Key III" device has been designed to enhance the functionality and theft protection of the first and second-generation "PASS-Key" and "PASS-Key II" devices. However, as in the first and second-generation "PASS-Key" devices, the "PASS-Key III" device does not provide an alarm, either audible or visual to attract the attention to the efforts of an unauthorized person to enter or move the vehicle by means other than a key 49 CFR § 543.6(a)(3)(ii). To substantiate its belief that an alarm system is not a necessary feature to effectively deter the theft of a vehicle, GM compared the reduction in thefts for Corvettes equipped with a passive antitheft device with an audible/visible alarm feature (24% reduction), and the Chevrolet Camaro and Pontiac Firebird car lines

equipped with a passive antitheft device *without* an alarm feature (66% and 69% reduction).

The following GM car lines have the "PASS-Key" device as standard equipment and have been exempted in part from the requirements of 49 CFR Part 541: the Chevrolet Camaro and Pontiac Firebird, beginning with MY 1990 (See 54 FR 3365, August 15, 1989); the Cadillac DeVille/Fleetwood and Oldsmobile 98, beginning with MY 1991 (See 55 FR 17854, April 27, 1990); and the Pontiac Bonneville, beginning with MY 1992 (See 56 FR 14413, April 9, 1991). NHTSA has also granted exemptions in part for the following GM car lines that have "PASS-Key II" as standard equipment: the Oldsmobile 88 Royale and Buick LeSabre, beginning with MY 1993 (See 57 FR 10517, March 26, 1992) and the Cadillac Eldorado and Cadillac Seville, beginning with MY 1994 (see 58 FR 11659, February 26, 1993).

The agency had granted partial, rather than full exemptions for the car lines listed above because neither the "PASS-Key" nor "PASS-Key II" antitheft devices included an audible or visual alarm system. As such, the GM systems lack, as standard equipment, an important feature that the agency has defined in its rulemaking on Part 543 as one of several attributes which contribute to the effectiveness of an antitheft device: automatic activation of the device; an audible or visual signal that is connected to the hood, doors, and trunk, and draws attention to vehicle tampering; and a disabling mechanism designed to prevent a thief from moving a vehicle under its own power without a key.

Since deciding those petitions, however, the agency has become aware that theft data show declining theft rates for GM vehicles equipped with either version of the "PASS-Key" device. A comparison of theft data for car lines incorporating the "PASS-Key" and "PASS-Key II" devices do not show that the lack of an audible or visual alarm system detracts from the effectiveness of the "PASS-Key" and "PASS-Key II" devices. The agency believes that the data show that over time, despite the absence of an audible or visual alarm system, the "PASS-Key" and "PASS-Key II" devices, when placed on car lines as standard equipment, are as likely to be as effective in deterring and reducing motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements.

Based on this information, the agency has granted two GM petitions for full exemptions for car lines equipped with the "PASS-Key II" antitheft device.

Those lines are the Chevrolet Lumina and Buick Regal car lines (See 60 FR 25938, May 15, 1995) and the Buick Riviera and Oldsmobile Aurora car lines (See 58 FR 44872, August 25, 1993). In both of those instances, the agency concluded that a full exemption was warranted because the "PASS-Key II" device had shown itself to be as likely as parts marking to be effective protection against theft despite the absence of a visual or audible alarm. Because the "PASS-Key III" device to be used in the Cadillac Seville beginning in MY 1998 is an improved version of these systems, the agency concludes that a full exemption is appropriate for this car line as well. NHTSA has also granted an exemption in full for the Buick Park Avenue car line which has had the "PASS-Key III" device as standard equipment beginning with the 1997 model year (See 61 FR 25734, May 22, 1996).

To ensure reliability and durability of the device, GM stated that it conducted tests based on its own specified standards. GM provided the test results for the "PASS-Key III" device showing that the device complied with the specified performance requirements of each test. GM stated that the "PASS-Key III" device complied with its standards for power temperature cycling, high and low temperature storage, humidity, salt fog, drop, dust, thermal shock, frost, altitude, shock, random vibration, potential contaminants, flammability, terminal retention, crush, connector retention/strain relief and connector insertion.

To substantiate its beliefs as to the effectiveness of the "PASS-Key III" antitheft device, GM compared its MY 1998 antitheft modification to similar devices that have previously been granted exemptions by the agency. GM provided data on the Chevrolet Camaro, Pontiac Firebird, Cadillac DeVille/Fleetwood, Cadillac Seville and Cadillac Eldorado car line theft rates for MYs 1986 through 1991. "PASS-Key" was made standard on the Camaro, Firebird, Seville and Eldorado beginning with MY 1989 and on the DeVille/Fleetwood beginning with MY 1990. The data provided by GM were reported by the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Crime Information Center (NCIC), which is NHTSA's official source of theft data (See 50 FR 46666, November 12, 1985). The NCIC receives reports on all thefts.

The NCIC data reported by GM showed that the Camaro, Firebird, DeVille/Fleetwood, Seville and Eldorado theft rates (per thousand vehicles) by Model Year were: For MY 1986, 29.49 for the Camaro, 27.83 for the

Firebird, 7.11 for the DeVille/Fleetwood, 1.71 for the Seville and 2.27 for the Eldorado; for MY 1987, 26.03 for the Camaro, 30.14 for the Firebird, 6.16 for the DeVille/Fleetwood, 9.24 for the Seville and 3.90 for the Eldorado; for MY 1988, 25.74 for the Camaro, 29.39 for the Firebird, 7.91 for the DeVille/Fleetwood, 9.54 for the Seville and 3.16 for the Eldorado; for MY 1989, 8.69 for the Camaro, 9.00 for the Firebird, 5.57 for the DeVille/Fleetwood, 8.31 for the Seville and 2.35 for the Eldorado; for MY 1990, 9.04 for the Camaro, 8.04 for the Firebird, 3.85 for the DeVille/Fleetwood, 9.43 for the Seville and 2.44 for the Eldorado; for MY 1991, 7.80 for the Camaro, 6.37 for the Firebird, 4.06 for the DeVille/Fleetwood, 7.95 for the Seville and 2.83 for the Eldorado.

GM believes that based on the reduced theft rates of its "PASS-Key" and "PASS-Key II" equipped car lines and the proven theft-deterrence success of transponder electronics security, the "PASS-Key III" device to be introduced on the MY 1998 Cadillac Seville is likely to be more effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft than compliance with the parts marking requirements of 49 CFR Part 541.

The agency believes that there is substantial evidence indicating that the modified antitheft device to be installed as standard equipment on the MY 1998 Cadillac Seville car line will likely be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard (49 CFR Part 541). This determination is based on the information that GM submitted with its petition and on other available information. The agency believes that the modified device will continue to provide all but one of the aspects of performance listed in Section 543.6(a)(3): promoting activation; preventing defeat or circumventing 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 CFR Section 543.6(a)(4), the agency also finds that GM has provided adequate reasons for its belief that the modified antitheft device will reduce and deter theft. This conclusion is based on the information GM provided on its "PASS-Key III" device. This information included a description of reliability and functional tests conducted by GM for the "PASS-Key III" antitheft device and its components.

For the foregoing reasons, the agency hereby exempts the Cadillac Seville car line, which is the subject of this notice,

in whole, from the requirements of 49 CFR Part 541.

Section 543.9(h)(2)(i), specifically reads, “. . . an exemption under this section takes effect on the first day of the model year following the model year in which NHTSA issued the modification decision.” Therefore, since the agency is issuing its decision on the General Motors Corporation modification during model year 1997, the modification for the Buick Park Avenue car line becomes effective beginning with Model Year 1998.

If, in the future, GM decides not to use the exemption for the car line that is the subject of this notice, it should formally notify the agency. If such a decision is made, the car line must be fully marked according to the requirements under 49 CFR Section 541.5 and Section 541.6 (marking of major component parts and replacement parts).

NHTSA notes that if GM wishes in the future to modify the device on which this exemption is based, it 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, Section 543.9(c)(2) provides for the submission of petitions “(t)o 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 which section 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: April 18, 1997.

**L. Robert Shelton,**

*Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.*

[FR Doc. 97-10603 Filed 4-23-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 33385]

#### Railroad Ventures, Inc.—Acquisition and Operation Exemption—Youngstown & Southern Railroad Company

Railroad Ventures, Inc. (RVI), a noncarrier, has filed a verified notice of exemption under 49 CFR 1150.31(a)(1) to acquire and operate approximately 35.7 miles of line purportedly owned by Youngstown & Southern Railroad Company (Y&S),<sup>1</sup> extending from milepost 0.00, near Struthers, OH, to milepost 35.7, near Darlington, PA, and an additional 1-mile segment of the Smith Ferry Branch line near Negley, OH. Pursuant to the exemption, RVI also will acquire incidental trackage rights over a 2.65-mile of line between Struthers and Youngstown, OH, for the purposes of interchange with Consolidated Rail Corporation and CSX Transportation, Inc.<sup>2</sup>

The transaction was consummated without appropriate authority on November 8, 1996.<sup>3</sup>

If the verified notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio*. Petitions to reopen the proceeding to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed

<sup>1</sup> RVI states that Y&S is a non-operating railroad and a wholly owned subsidiary of the Montour Railroad Company (Montour), a non-operating railroad, which in turn is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Pittsburgh and Lake Erie Properties, Inc., the successor in interest to The Pittsburgh and Lake Erie Railroad Company. Pittsburgh and Lake Erie Properties, Inc., is a noncarrier and is presently in bankruptcy proceedings before the United States Federal District Court in Delaware. In re Pittsburgh & Lake Erie Properties, Inc. AKA The Pittsburgh and Lake Erie Railroad Company, 96-00406-HSB, filed March 26, 1996. Neither Montour nor Y&S are Debtors in the Pittsburgh and Lake Erie Properties, Inc., bankruptcy proceeding.

<sup>2</sup> On April 8, 1997, the Ohio Rail Development Commission and the Columbiana County Port Authority jointly filed a petition to reject, revoke, or stay the notice of exemption. Petitioners did not address the Board's stay criteria, and the exemption was not stayed prior to its scheduled effectiveness on April 9, 1997. Because RVI appears to have provided sufficient information to invoke the class exemption for noncarriers to acquire and operate an active line of railroad and also to have provided responses to questions asked in the decision that rejected RVI's first attempt to invoke this class exemption, the notice will not be rejected at this time. See Railroad Ventures, Inc.—Acquisition and Operation Exemption—Youngstown and Southern Railway Company, Finance Docket No. 33336 (STB served Jan. 9, 1997). The merits of the petition to revoke, and, to the extent necessary or appropriate, the petition to reject, will be decided by the entire Board in a subsequent decision.

<sup>3</sup> Upon becoming aware of the need for the Board's approval or exemption of the transaction, RVI took steps to invoke the class exemption procedures in Finance Docket No. 33336.

at any time.<sup>4</sup> The filing of a petition to reopen will not automatically stay the transaction.

An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to STB Finance Docket No. 33385, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board, Office of the Secretary, Case Control Unit, 1925 K Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20423-0001. In addition, a copy of each pleading must be served on John A. Vuono, Esq., Vuono & Gray, LLC, 2310 Grant Building, Pittsburgh, PA 15219.

Decided: April 16, 1997.

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

**Vernon A. Williams,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97-10645 Filed 4-23-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915-00-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Office of Economic Policy; Notice Inviting Comment on a Proposed Information Collection: Outbound Portfolio Investment Survey, Survey of US. Ownership of Foreign Long-Term Securities

**Correction:** In notice document 97-8012 appearing on page 15218 in the issue of March 31, 1997, delete the first sentence after “Estimated Time per Respondent:” and add instead “240 hours on average for custodians of securities providing detailed information. 80 hours on average for end-investors providing detailed information.”

**Joshua Gotbaum,**

*Assistant Secretary for Economic Policy.*

[FR Doc. 97-10562 Filed 4-23-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-25-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Submission to OMB for Review; Comment Request

April 14, 1997.

The Department of Treasury has submitted the following public information collection requirement(s) to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by

<sup>4</sup> The Ohio Rail Development Commission and Columbiana County Port Authority have filed a petition for declaratory order asking that the acquisition by RVI be declared void *ab initio* in STB Docket No. 41991, Ohio Rail Development Commission and Columbiana County Port Authority—Petition for Declaratory Order—Certain Actions of Railroad Ventures, Inc. This proceeding is currently pending.