

be shared with other U.S. Government agencies, such as U.S. Customs Service, which collects similar information from passengers for input into its Advance Passenger Information System (APIS), would any additional privacy concerns arise? Are there ways to overcome these privacy concerns?

6. We have been told that air carriers currently are reluctant to provide passenger information to the Department of State in the absence of a waiver of responsibility for disclosure of the information to third parties. What falls within the ambit of this issue? To what extent does the 1974 Privacy Act govern this issue?

Similar Information Requirements

7. The Advance Passenger Information System (APIS) of the U.S. Customs Service requires participating air carriers (participation is voluntary) to collect a passenger's full name, passport number, date of birth, and other information, but not contact information. U.S. Customs provides electronic passport readers to air carriers participating in the program. APIS information (API) is currently collected for about 50 percent of U.S.-incoming passengers (U.S. citizens and non-U.S. citizens). For a covered flight, API is collected on the ground and then transmitted to the U.S. Customs Service while the flight is en route, so, were an APIS-covered flight to end in disaster, the API would be available for immediate transmittal to the Department of State. API is collected by using electronic scanning devices to scan the information on the optical character recognition (OCR) zone of U.S. and other countries' machine-readable passports. (Emergency contact information is not available from the magnetic strip.) Could the API information be used to fulfill the passenger manifest information requirement of section 203? If air carriers were required to also collect contact information for U.S. citizens on APIS flights, how would they likely do so? What would be the practical effects of doing so?

8. It is our understanding that as part of the passport application, the Department of State currently collect information on emergency contacts. It is also our understanding that this contact information is optional, that is, the information is not required to be provided in order to receive a passport. Further, we understand that the Department of State's passport information is automated and that, if provided, contact information is maintained as part of this automated passport information. We would like to

know what role this Department of State contact information might play in identifying the families of passengers aboard a flight that ends in disaster? What information is needed to access Department of State passport records? Can these records be accurately accessed using APIS information?

Information Collection Technique

9. Some comments received by DOT said that passenger manifest information, by necessity, would have to be collected primarily at the time of reservation in computer reservation systems (CRSs). (It was, however, recognized in these comments that all passengers would not provide the information at the time of reservation, and thus that provision would also have to be made to collect the information from some passengers at the airport.) Others have mentioned the approach of redesigning boarding passes so they would have a detachable stub that could be filled out by passengers and dropped in a box just before boarding their flight. APIS, the closest counterpart collection system that we are aware of, usually involves, as we understand it, airport scanning of passports with input of the information into the air carrier's CRS. What are the pros and cons of these different collection systems for the large scale collection of passenger manifest information?

Elements of the Cost of Collecting Passenger Manifest Information

10. Executive order 12866 requires the Department of Transportation to quantify the costs and benefits of regulations that it proposes and issues. What are the cost elements that would be involved in collecting passenger manifest information, limiting the discussion to only the additional costs that would be incurred? How much additional time would it take to collect passenger manifest information from a passenger? What would one-time costs consist of? What would recurring, annual costs consist of? Approximately what percentage of recurring, annual costs would be for additional personnel to collect the information? Give an approximate compensation (salary plus benefits) figure for the additional personnel that would collect the information?

Issued in Washington, D.C. on March 12, 1996

Patrick V. Murphy,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs.

[FR Doc. 96-6357 Filed 3-14-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-62-P

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 21

Request for Comments Concerning Guides for the Mirror Industry

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Request for public comments.

SUMMARY: The Federal Trade Commission (the "Commission") is requesting public comments on its Guides for the Mirror Industry (the "Mirror Guides" or "these Guides"). The Commission is also requesting comments about the overall costs and benefits of these Guides and their overall regulatory and economic impact as a part of its systematic review of all current Commission regulations and guides.

DATES: Written comments will be accepted until April 15, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be directed to: Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, Room H-159, Sixth and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20580. Comments about the Mirror Guides should be identified as "16 CFR Part 21—Comment."

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jessica D. Gray, Attorney, Federal Trade Commission, Boston Regional Office, 101 Merrimac Street, Suite 810, Boston, MA 02114-4719, (617) 424-5960.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission has determined, as part of its oversight responsibilities, to review rules and guides periodically. These reviews will seek information about the costs and benefits of the Commission's rules and guides and their regulatory and economic impact. The information obtained will assist the Commission in identifying rules and guides that warrant modification or rescission.

A. Background

The Mirror Guides, promulgated by the Commission on June 30, 1962, and amended on September 13, 1972 (16 CFR Part 118) (1972), and February 27, 1979 (44 FR 11183 (1979)), give guidance about acceptable and unacceptable claims made in advertising or promotional materials used during the sale or distribution of mirrors. Specifically, these Guides make it an unfair or deceptive act or practice for any industry member in connection with the sale, offering for sale, or distribution of mirrors to use any advertisement or representation that is false or has the tendency to mislead purchasers or prospective purchasers with respect to the type, grade, quality, quantity, use, size, design, material,

finish, strength, backing, silvering, thickness, composition, origin, preparation, manufacture, value, or distribution of any mirror.

In addition, these Guides make it an unfair or deceptive act or practice for any member of the industry to sell, offer for sale, or distribute any mirror under any representation or circumstance having the capacity to mislead or deceive purchasers or prospective purchasers with regard to the type or kind of glass contained in any mirror or the type of backing.

B. Issues for Comment

At this time, the Commission solicits written public comments on the following questions:

(1) Is there a continuing need for the Mirror Guides?

(a) What benefits have these Guides provided to purchasers of the products or services affected by them?

(b) Have these Guides imposed costs on purchasers?

(2) What changes, if any, should be made to these Guides to increase their benefits to purchasers?

(a) How would these changes affect the costs that these Guides impose on firms subject to their requirements?

(3) What significant burden or costs, including costs of compliance, have these Guides imposed on firms subject to their requirements?

(a) Have these Guides provided benefits to such firms?

(4) What changes, if any, should be made to these Guides to reduce the burden or costs imposed on firms subject to their requirements?

(a) How would these changes affect the benefits provided by these Guides?

(5) Do these Guides overlap or conflict with other federal, state, or local laws or regulations?

(6) What changes, if any, have been made in the technology used to manufacture the glass used in making mirrors that may address the issues of whether mirrors may be advertised as being "distortion free" or "shatter proof?"

(7) Have efforts been made to standardize the technology used for "backing" mirrors?

(8) Since the Mirror Guides were issued, what effects, if any, have changes in relevant technology or economic conditions had on them?

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 41-58.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-6255 Filed 3-14-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

29 CFR Part 103

Appropriateness of Requested Single Location Bargaining Units in Representation Cases

AGENCY: National Labor Relations Board.

ACTION: Notice of extension of time for filing comments to proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The National Labor Relations Board gives notice that it is extending the time for filing comments on the proposed rulemaking on the appropriateness of requested single location bargaining units in representation cases because of matters raised during the March 7, 1996, hearing and a request for extension.

DATES: The comment period which presently ends at the close of business on March 15, 1996, is extended to the close of business on April 12, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments on the proposed rulemaking should be sent to: Office of the Executive Secretary, 1099 14th Street, NW., Room 11600, Washington, DC 20570.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John J. Toner, Executive Secretary, Telephone: (202) 273-1940.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Board's notice of proposed rulemaking on the appropriateness of requested single location bargaining units in representation cases was published in the Federal Register on September 28, 1995 (60 FR 50146). The notice provided that all responses to the notice of proposed rulemaking must be received on or before November 27, 1995. On November 20, 1995 the Board extended the time to January 22, 1996. Because of the recent shutdown of operations due to lack of appropriated funds, the Board extended the time to February 8, 1996. In view of public interest, the Board further extended the period for filing responses to the notice of proposed rulemaking until the close of business on Friday, March 15, 1996.

On March 7, 1996, the House Subcommittee on Regulation and Paperwork of the Committee on Small Business of the U.S. House of Representatives conducted an oversight hearing regarding the proposed rule and on March 8, 1996, United Food & Commercial Workers International Union, AFL-CIO, requested the Board to extend the period for filing comments to the proposed rule to April 12, 1996. In light of the matters raised during the March 7 hearing and the request of

United Food & Commercial Workers International Union, AFL-CIO for an extension of time, the Board extends the period for filing responses to the notice of proposed rulemaking until April 12, 1996.

Dated, Washington, DC, March 11, 1996.

By direction of the Board.

John J. Toner,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-6159 Filed 3-14-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7545-01-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Parts 5, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 73, 74, 78, 80, 87, 90, 94, 95, and 97

[ET Docket No. 96-2; RM-8165; FCC 96-12]

Arecibo Coordination Zone

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: By this Notice of Proposed Rule Making ("NPRM"), the Commission proposes to designate the Puerto Rican Islands of Puerto Rico, Desecheo, Mona, Vieques, and Culebra as a Coordination Zone, in order that the Arecibo Radio Astronomy Observatory (Observatory) near Arecibo, Puerto Rico may be notified of certain proposed radio operations. This proposal would require applicants for a new station or for a modification of facilities within the requested Coordination Zone, to simultaneously notify the Observatory of the technical particulars of the proposed operations at the time of filing their applications with the Commission. The NPRM also proposes to require applicants for short-term broadcast auxiliary services within the Coordination Zone to notify the Observatory in advance of their proposed operations, except in emergency situations. In addition, the NPRM proposes to require new amateur beacon and repeater stations within 10 miles of the Observatory to be coordinated. This NPRM would make it possible for the Observatory and applicants to coordinate and share information in order to avoid harmful interference to sensitive, nationally important radio astronomy operations.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before April 1, 1996 and reply comments must be filed on or before April 16, 1996. Written comments by the public on the proposed and/or modified information collections are due April 1, 1996. Written comments