other persons, in their transactions and relations with CityFed, are subject to sections 9, 17(a), 17(d), 17(e), 17(f), 36 through 45, and 47 through 51 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 defined 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:

a. 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

b. in connections with each such transaction, CityFed shall inform the bankruptcy court of (i) the identity of all of its affiliated 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 H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–1803 Filed 1–26–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–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, The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

1. Government Pension Questionnaire—0960–0160. 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: 12.5 minutes.

Estimated Average Burden: 6,250 hours.

2. Statement Regarding the Inferred Death of an Individual by Reason of Continued and Unexplained Absence—09060–0002. 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 individual 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, DCFAM, Attn: Frederick W. Brickenkamp, 6401 Security Blvd., 1–A–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 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) 965–4145 or write to him at the address listed above.

Dated: 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 4190–29–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 2007.0(b).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: GSP Subcommittee, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW, Room 518, Washington, DC 20508 (Tel. 202/395–6971). Public versions of all documents relating to this review may be seen by appointment in the USTR public Reading Room between 9:30–12 a.m. and 1–4 p.m. (Tel. 202/395–6186).

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 treatment to designated eligible articles that are imported from designated beneficiary developing countries. In 1998 USTR received three new petitions requesting that certain practices in certain beneficiary developing countries be reviewed to determine whether such countries are in compliance with the eligibility criteria set forth in sections 502(b) and 502(c) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2462(b) and 2462(c)).

I. Subject of Review

Pursuant to 15 CFR 2007.0(b), the Trade Policy Staff Committee has accepted a petition to review the GSP status of India for its alleged failure to provide equitable and reasonable access to its soda ash market. Petitions concerning the enforcement of internationally recognized worker rights in Guatemala and Cambodia were not accepted for review.

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 notified in a future **Federal Register** notice.

II. Opportunities for Public Comment and Inspection of Comments

The GSP Subcommittee of the TPSC invites comments in support of, or in opposition to, the petition which is the subject of this notice. Submissions should comply with 15 CFR Part 2007, including sections 2007.0 and 2007.1.

Comments should be submitted in fourteen (14) copies, in English, to the Chairman of the GSP Subcommittee of the Trade Policy Staff Committee, 600 17th Street, NW, Room 518, Washington, DC 20508. Information submitted will be subject to public inspection by appointment with the staff of the USTR public reading room, except for information granted ''business confidential'' status pursuant to 15 CFR 2003.6 and other qualifying information submitted in confidence pursuant to 15 CFR 2007.7. If the document contains business confidential information, an original and fourteen (14) copies of a nonconfidential version of the submission along with an original and fourteen (14) copies of the confidential version must be submitted. In addition, any document containing confidential information should be clearly marked ''confidential'' at the top and bottom of each page of the document. The version that does not contain confidential information (the public version) should be clearly marked at the top and bottom of every page (either ''public version'' or ''nonconfidential'').

III. Notice of Public Hearings

A hearing will be held on March 23, 1999 at 10:00 a.m. at 1724 F Street, NW, Washington, DC 20508. The hearing will be open to the public and a transcript of the hearing will be made available for public inspection or can be purchased from the reporting company. No electronic media coverage will be allowed.

All interested parties wishing to present oral testimony at the hearing must submit the name, address, and telephone number of the witness(es) representing their organization to the Chairman of the GSP Subcommittee. Such requests to present oral testimony at the public hearings should be accompanied by fourteen (14) copies, in English, of a written brief or statement, and should be received by 5 p.m. on March 15, 1999. Oral testimony before the GSP Subcommittee will be limited to ten minute presentations that summarize or supplement information contained in the briefs or statements or supplement information contained in the briefs or statements submitted for the record. Post-hearing and rebuttal 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 15, 1999, and post-hearing and 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 3190–01–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 (CIRCAC). The effective period of this recertification is from June 1, 1998 to July 31, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information regarding the CIRCAC contact LT Pittmen, Marine Safety and Environmental Protection Directorate, Office of Response, (G–MOR–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(o) 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 CIRCAC. 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 CIRCAC and requested comments (63 FR 42475). It received 14 comments to the docket.

Discussion of Comments

One commenter indicates that the CIRCAC 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 CIRCAC; in addition, the City of Homer offered no letter to the docket indicating any dissatisfaction with the CIRCAC. We believe the CIRCAC has successfully taken steps to resolve this potential difficulty.

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

Two commenters complain that the CIRCAC has no vision, goals, and objectives. The CIRCAC 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