other persons, in their transactions and
relations with CityFed, are subject to
sections 9, 17(a), 17(d), 17(e), 17(i), 36
through 45, and 47 through 81 of the
Act, and the rules thereunder, as if
CityFed were a registered investment
company, except as permitted by the
requested order.

Notwithstanding sections 17(a) and
17(d) of the Act, an affiliated person (as
declared in section 2(a)(3) of the Act) of
CityFed may engage in a transaction that
otherwise would be prohibited by these
sections with CityFed:

1. If such proposed transaction is first
approved by a bankruptcy court on the
basis that (i) the terms thereof including
the consideration to be paid or received,
are reasonable and fair to CityFed, and
(ii) the participation of CityFed in the
proposed transaction will not be on a
basis less advantageous to CityFed than
that of other participants; and

2. In connections with each such
transaction, CityFed shall inform the
bankruptcy court of (i) the identity of all
persons who are parties to, or have a direct or indirect financial
interest in, the transaction; (ii) the
nature of the affiliation; and (iii) the
financial interests of such persons in the
transaction.

For the SEC, by the Division of Investment
Management, under delegated authority.
Margaret M. Farland,
Deputy Secretary.
[FR Doc. 99-1803 Filed 1-26-99; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 5100-01-M

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Agency Information Collection
Activities; Proposed Collection
Requests

This notice lists information
collection packages that will require
submission to the Office of Management
and Budget (OMB), in compliance with
PL 104-13 effective October 1, 1995.

Subject

Questionsnaire—0990-0106. The Social
Security Act and Regulations provide
that an individual receiving spouse's
benefits and concurrently receiving a
Government pension, based on the
individual's own earnings, may have the
Social Security benefits amount reduced
by two-thirds of the pension amount.
The data collected on Form SSA-3885
is used by the Social Security
Administration (SSA) to determine if the
individual's Social Security benefit
will be reduced, the amount of
reduction, the effective date of the
reduction and if one of the exceptions
in 20 CFR404.408a applies. The
respondents are individuals who are
receiving (or will receive) Social
Security spouse benefits and also
receive their own Government pension.

Number of Respondents: 30,000.
Frequency of Response: 1
Average Burden Per Response: 15
minutes.

Statement Regarding the Inferred
Death of an Individual by Reason of
Continued and Unexplained Absence
0800-0802. The information collected
on form SSA-723 is used to determine
if the Social Security Administration
may infer that a missing person is
deceased. The respondents are
individuals who know or are related to
the missing person.

Number of Respondents: 30,000.
Frequency of Response: 1
Average Burden Per Response: 30
minutes.

Estimated Average Burden: 1,500
hours.

Written comments and
recommendations regarding the
information collection(s) should be sent
within 60 days from the date of this
publication, directly to the SSA Reports
Clearance Officer at the following
address: Social Security Administration,
EO/PAM, Attn: Frederick W.
Brickenkamp, SSA, 6401 Security Blvd.,
1A-21 Operations Bldg., Baltimore, MD
21235.

In addition to your comments on the
accuracy of the agency's burden
estimate, we are soliciting comments on
the need for the information; its
practical utility; ways to enhance its
quality, utility and clarity; and on ways
to minimize burden on respondents,
including the use of automated
information collection techniques or other forms of
information technology.

To receive a copy of any of the forms
or clearance packages, call the SSA
Reports Clearance Officer on (410) 655-
4145 or write to him at the address
described above.

Date: January 21, 1999,
Frederick W. Brickenkamp,
Reports Clearance Officer, Social Security
Administration.
[FR Doc. 99-1871 Filed 1-26-99; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4100-01-M

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES
TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Generalized System of Preferences
(GSP); Schedule for a Hearing and
Deadlines for Submitting Comments
on Soda Ash Petition for the GSP 1998
Country Practices Review

AGENCY: Office of the United States
Trade Representative (USTR).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is
to set forth the timetable for a hearing,
and for providing public comments on
a petition requesting the modification in
the status of a GSP beneficiary country
in regard to its practices, as specified in
15 CFR 2007.9(b).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: GSP
Subcommittee, Office of the United
States Trade Representative, 600 17th
Street, NW, Room 518, Washington, DC
20591 (Tel: 202/395-0971). Public
versions of all documents related to
this review may be seen by appointment
in the USTR Public Reading Room
between 9:30–12 noon and 1–4 p.m.
(Tel: 202/395-6166).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The GSP
program is authorized pursuant to Title
V of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended
(“the Trade Act”) (19 U.S.C. 2461 et
seq.). The GSP program grants duty-free
status to designated eligible articles
that are imported from designated
beneficiary developing countries.

USTR received three new petitions
requesting that certain beneficiary
countries be reviewed to determine whether such
countries are in compliance with the
eligibility criteria set forth in sections
532(b) and 532(c) of the Trade Act (19
U.S.C. 2462(b) and 2462(c)).

I. Subject of Review

Pursuant to 15 CFR 2007.9(b), the
Trade Policy Staff Committees has
accepted a petition to review the CSP
status of India for its alleged failure to
provide equitable and reasonable access
to its soda ash market. Petitions
relating to GSP beneficiary countries
identified in the petition must be
notified in a future Federal Register
notice.

Any modifications to the list of
beneficiary developing countries for
purposes of the GSP program resulting
from the Country Practices Review
will take effect on such date as will be
determined by the Office of the
United States Trade Representative.

II. Antidumping

I. Inquiries
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briefs or statements should conform to the regulations cited above and be submitted in fourteen (14) copies, in English, no later than 5 p.m. April 8, 1999. Interested persons not wishing to appear at the public hearings may also submit pre-hearing written briefs or statements by 5:00 p.m. on March 12, 1999, and post-hearing rebuttal written briefs or statements by April 8, 1999.

Frederick L. Montgomery,
Chairman, Trade Policy Staff Committee.
[FR Doc. 99-1842 Filed 1-26-99; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

[USCG-1998-4272]

Annual Certification of Cook Inlet Regional Citizens' Advisory Council

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of recertification.

SUMMARY: Under the Oil Terminal and Oil Tanker Environmental Oversight Act of 1990, the Coast Guard may certify on an annual basis, an alternative voluntary advisory group in lieu of a regional citizens' advisory council for Cook Inlet, Alaska. This certification allows the advisory group to monitor the activities of terminal facilities and crude oil tankers under the Cook Inlet Program established by the statute. The purpose of this notice is to inform the public that the Coast Guard has recertified the alternative voluntary advisory group for Cook Inlet, Alaska. The period of certification is being administratively adjusted to allow realignment of the recertification process with the annual budget year of the Cook Inlet Regional Citizens' Advisory Council (CIRAC). The effective period of this recertification is from June 1, 1998 to July 31, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information regarding the CIRAC contact L.T. Pittman, Marine Safety and Environmental Protection Directorate, Office of Response, (CMOR-1), (202) 267-0426. For questions on viewing material submitted to the docket, contact Dorothy Walker, Chief, Dockets, Department of Transportation, telephone 202-366-9329.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: As part of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, Congress passed the Oil Terminal and Oil Tanker Environmental Oversight and Monitoring Act of 1990 (the Act), section 5002, to foster the long-term partnership among industry, government, and local communities in overseeing compliance with the environmental concerns in the operation of terminal facilities and crude-oil tankers. Subsection 5002(a) permits an alternative voluntary advisory group to represent the communities and interests in the vicinity of the terminal facilities in the Cook Inlet, in lieu of a council of the type specified in subsection 5002(d), if certain conditions are met. The Act requires that the group enter into a contract to ensure annual funding, and that it receive annual certification by the President to the effect that it fosters the general goals and purposes of the Act and is broadly representative of the communities and interests in the vicinity of the terminal facilities and Cook Inlet. Accordingly, in 1991, the President granted certification to the CIRAC. The authority to certify alternative voluntary advisory groups was subsequently delegated to the Commandant of the Coast Guard and redelegated to the Assistant Commandant for Marine Safety and Environmental Protection.

On August 7, 1998, in the Federal Register, the Coast Guard announced the availability of the application for recertification that it received from the CIRAC and requested comments (63 FR 42475). It received 14 comments to the docket.

Discussion of Comments

One commenter indicates that the CIRAC did not obtain adequate input from the city of Homer. In a meeting with the Executive Director the Coast Guard learned that the Mayor of Homer is now on the Board of the CIRAC; in addition, the City of Homer offered no letter to the docket indicating any dissatisfaction with the CIRAC. We believe the CIRAC has successfully taken steps to resolve this potential difficulty.

One commenter believes the government should fund the CIRAC. The statute does not authorize federal funding of the CIRAC. Another commenter complains that the CIRAC is underfunded. This comment does not pertain directly to the determination of recertification but rather to contractual provisions.

Two commenters complain that the CIRAC has no vision, goals, and objectives. The CIRAC indicated in a letter to the Coast Guard clarifying concerns and questions related to recertification that they use the goals and objectives of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA 90) as identified in the context of the alternative voluntary advisory groups. Considering the fact