N_{pc} = the national front outboard passenger car seat belt use rate from NOPUS

N_{ltv} = the national front outboard LTV seat belt use rate from NOPUS

R_{pc} = the portion of State passenger motor vehicle registrations that are passenger cars

R_{ltv} = the portion of State passenger motor vehicle registrations that are LTVs

N_s = the national seat belt use rate for the State-surveyed vehicle and occupant population (or closest available group from NOPUS)

Appendix B—Procedures for Missing or Inadequate State-Submitted Information (Calendar Years 1996 and 1997)

A. If State-submitted seat belt use rate information is unavailable or inadequate for both calendar years 1996 and 1997, State seat belt use rates for calendars year 1996 and 1997 will be estimated based on seat belt use rates of fatally-injured occupants. Data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) will be translated into estimated observed seat belt use rates using an algorithm that relates historical belt use by fatally-injured occupants to observed use.[1]

B. The algorithm is as follows:

$$u = (-.221794 + \sqrt{.049193 + .410769F}) / .456410$$

Where:

u = the estimated observed seat belt use

F = the seat belt use in potentially fatal crashes

In the above formula, F is calculated as follows:

$$F = (f / (1-e)) / ((f / (1-e)) + 1 - f)$$

Where:

F = the seat belt use in potentially fatal crashes

e = State-specific weighted average effectiveness of seat belts in passenger cars and passenger motor vehicles that are not passenger cars

f = State-specific seat belt use rate of fatally-injured occupants of passenger vehicles

C. If State-submitted seat belt use rate information is available for either calendar year 1996 or 1997, but not both, a State seat belt use rate for the year for which information is missing will be estimated by calculating the percent change in the FARS-based observed seat belt use rate (derived from the above algorithm) between the two years. This factor will then be applied to the seat belt use rate from the known year to derive an estimate of the seat belt use rate for the unknown year.

Appendix C—Certification (Calendar Year 1998 Survey Based on Survey Approved Under 23 U.S.C. 153)

State Certification-Calendar Year 1998 Seat Belt Use Survey

State of _____ _____

Seat Belt Use Rate Reported for Calendar Year _____ : _____ %.

In accordance with the provisions of 23 CFR 1240.12(c)(2), I hereby certify as follows:

1. The seat belt use rate reported above is based on a survey whose design was approved by NHTSA, in writing, on or after June 29, 1992, under the provisions of the grant program authorized by 23 U.S.C. 153.

2. The survey design has remained unchanged since the survey was approved (except to the extent that the requirements of paragraph 3 constitute a change).

3. The survey samples all passenger motor vehicles (including cars, pickup trucks, vans, minivans, and sport utility vehicles), measures seat belt use by all front outboard occupants in the sampled vehicles, and counts seat belt use completely within the calendar year for which the seat belt use rate is reported.

_____

Governor's Representative for Highway Safety

_____

(Date)

Appendix D—Determination of National Average Seat Belt Use Rate

A. To determine the national average seat belt use rate in a calendar year, each State seat belt use rate for the calendar year will be weighted to reflect the percentage of total national vehicle miles traveled attributable to that State.

B. If a State seat belt use rate is unavailable for a State during a calendar year (either because the State did not conduct a seat belt use survey or a survey was conducted but does not comply with the Uniform Criteria for State Observational Surveys of Seat Belt Use, 23 CFR Part 1340), NHTSA will calculate a State seat belt use rate, using the last available State seat belt use rate determined under § 1240.11 or § 1240.12 of this part, as applicable, along with information on seat belt use rates from the FARS, and an algorithm relating FARS seat belt use rates to observed seat belt use rates (see Appendix 1, note). This procedure will produce an estimated State seat belt use rate for the unknown calendar year. The estimated State seat belt use rate will then be weighted in the manner described in paragraph A of this appendix.

C. The national average seat belt use rate for the calendar year will be determined by adding the weighted State seat belt use rates for each of the States (i.e., the national average seat belt use rate is the weighted average of all the State seat belt use rates).

D. NHTSA may elect to use a seat belt use survey that does not comply with the Uniform Criteria for State Observational Surveys of Seat Belt Use in determining the national average seat belt use rate (even though the State that submitted the survey is ineligible to receive an allocation of funds), if in NHTSA's judgment, the deficiencies in the survey are not so substantial as to render the survey less accurate than the FARS estimate.

Appendix E—Determination of Federal Medical Savings

A. To determine the savings to the Federal Government from reduced medical costs attributable to seat belt use, NHTSA will first estimate the impact of seat belt use on the number of fatalities and injuries, using methods described in the report ''Estimating the Benefits from Increased Safety Belt Use.''[1] These methods establish a relationship between the effectiveness of seat belts, current use rates, and existing injury levels to determine the impact of increasing seat belt use on motor vehicle safety. Using these methods, NHTSA will estimate the fatalities prevented and the non-fatal injuries avoided by increased seat belt use.

B. In the 1996 report ''The Economic Cost of Motor Vehicle Crashes, 1994,''[2] NHTSA measured both the medical costs and payment sources for motor vehicle crashes. NHTSA will adjust the national medical cost figures from this report to individual State income levels to reflect local cost levels. These per-case costs will be further adjusted for inflation, using the most recent annual average Consumer Price Index for medical care, and then multiplied by the injuries and fatalities prevented in each State to derive the total medical care savings from increased seat belt use. The Federal portion of these costs will be derived from the best available data found in the same cost report or in other sources, as they may become available.

Issued on: September 30, 1998.

Kenneth R. Wykle,

Administrator, Federal Highway Administration.

Ricardo Martinez,

Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–28811 Filed 10–23–98; 3:26 pm]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

[1] Blincoe, L.J. *Estimating the Benefits of Increased Safety Belt Use.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Transportation, NHTSA, DOT HS 808 133, June, 1994.

[2] Blincoe, L.J. *The Economic Cost of Motor Vehicle Crashes, 1994.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Transportation, NHTSA, DOT HS 808 425, July, 1996.

POSTAL SERVICE

39 CFR Part 6

Board of Governors Bylaws

AGENCY: Postal Service.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Board of Governors of the United States Postal Service has approved an amendment to its bylaws. The amendment allows Governors attending special meetings of the Board conducted by conference telephone call to receive the statutory $300 compensation for a meeting day if the meeting lasts more than an hour.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 6, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas J. Koerber, (202) 268–4800.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 6, 1998, the Board of Governors

of the Postal Service amended its bylaw provisions concerning attendance at meetings by telephone conference call. Previously, bylaw 6.4 (39 CFR 6.4), has provided that members may participate in any meeting of the Board of Governors by telephone, but that only those Governors attending in person would receive the $300 in compensation provided under 39 U.S.C. 202(a) for attending not more than 30 days of meetings per year.

Developments in technology since this bylaw was adopted have made it possible for modern business and government organizations to conduct meetings by teleconference more effectively than in the past. In addition, while the Board of Governors holds regular monthly meetings in person, generally two days in duration, the Board has found that important business sometimes requires the scheduling of special meetings by teleconference, in between the regularly scheduled monthly meetings, as authorized in bylaw 6.2 (39 CFR 6.2), and subject to compliance with the Board's rules implementing the Government in the Sunshine Act, in Part 7 of the bylaws (39 CFR part 7). The amendment approved on October 6 permits a Governor to receive the $300 in compensation for participation in such a special meeting of the full Board by teleconference, if the meeting is more than one hour in duration. It also allows compensation for special committee meetings held between Board meetings. As provided in 39 U.S.C. 202(a), nevertheless, the number of meeting days, including both regular and special meetings, for which a Governor may be paid such compensation still may not exceed 30 days per year.

List of Subjects in 39 CFR Part 6

Administrative practice and procedure, Organization and functions (Government agencies), Postal Service.

Accordingly, 39 CFR Part 6 is amended as follows:

PART 6—MEETINGS (ARTICLE VI)

1. The authority citation for Part 6 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 39 U.S.C. 202, 205, 401(2), (10), 1003, 3013; 5 U.S.C. 552b (3), (g).

2. Section 6.4 is revised to read as follows:

§ 6.4. Attendance by conference telephone call.

Unless prohibited by law or by these bylaws, a member of the Board may participate in a meeting of the Board by conference telephone or similar communications equipment which enables all persons participating in the meeting to hear each other and which permits full compliance with the provisions of these bylaws concerning public observation of meetings. Attendance at a meeting by this method constitutes presence at the meeting; and no Governor attending by telephone may receive compensation, except for a special meeting by conference telephone that is more than one hour in duration, or a special committee meeting between Board meetings called under § 6.2 of these bylaws.

Stanley F. Mires,

Chief Counsel, Legislative.

[FR Doc. 98–29006 Filed 10–28–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–12–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 271

[FRL–6179–7]

Michigan: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Immediate final rule.

SUMMARY: Michigan has applied for final authorization of the revisions to its hazardous waste program under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). The EPA has reviewed Michigan's application and determined that its hazardous waste program revision satisfies all of the requirements necessary to qualify for final authorization. Unless adverse written comments are received during the review and comment period, EPA's decision to authorize Michigan's hazardous waste program revision will take effect as provided below.

DATES: This immediate final rule will become effective on December 28, 1998. The immediate final rule will become effective without further notice unless EPA receives adverse written comments on or before November 30, 1998. Should the EPA receive such comments, it will publish a timely document withdrawing this rule.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to: Ms. Judy Feigler, Michigan Regulatory Specialist, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Waste, Pesticides and Toxics Division (DM–7J), 77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Illinois 60604. Copies of the Michigan program revision application and the materials which EPA used in evaluating the revision are available for inspection and copying from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. at the following addresses: Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, 608 W. Allegan, Hannah Building, Lansing, Michigan. Contact: Ms. Ronda Blayer, phone: (517) 353–9548; and EPA, Region 5, 77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Illinois 60604. Contact: Ms. Judy Feigler, phone: (312) 886–4179.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Judy Feigler, Michigan Regulatory Specialist, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Waste, Pesticides and Toxics Division (DM–7J), 77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Illinois 60604, phone: (312) 886–4179.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

States with final authorization under section 3006(b) of the RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6926(b), have a continuing obligation to maintain a hazardous waste program that is equivalent to, consistent with, and no less stringent than the Federal hazardous waste program. As the Federal hazardous waste program changes, the States must revise their programs and apply for authorization of the revisions. Revisions to State hazardous waste programs may be necessary when Federal or State statutory or regulatory authority is modified or when certain other changes occur. Most commonly, States must revise their programs because of changes to EPA's regulations in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) parts 124, 260 through 266, 268, 270, 273 and 279.

B. Michigan

Michigan initially received Final Authorization on October 16, 1986, effective October 30, 1986 (51 FR 36804–36805) to implement its base hazardous waste management program. Michigan received authorization for revisions to its program on November 24, 1989, effective January 23, 1990 (54 FR 48608); on April 23, 1991, effective June 24, 1991 (56 FR 18517); on October 1, 1993, effective November 30, 1993 (58 FR 51244); on January 13, 1995, effective January 13, 1995 (60 FR 3095); on February 8, 1996, effective on April 8, 1996 (61 FR 4742); and on November 14, 1997, effective November 14, 1997 (62 FR 61775).

The authorized Michigan RCRA program was incorporated by reference into the CFR effective April 24, 1989 (54 FR 7420). The incorporation by reference was amended on May 1, 1990, effective May 1, 1990 (55 FR 18112) and on January 31, 1992, effective March 31, 1992 (57 FR 3724).

On April 23, 1998, Michigan submitted a final complete program