

The reason given for the proposed changes is that the traffic on the route is such that the signal system is no longer required and it will reduce costs and improve train operations.

BS-AP—No. 3211

Applicants:

Central Vermont Railway, Incorporated, Mr. Chris J. Burger, General Manager, 2 Federal Street, St. Albans, Vermont 05478
National Railroad Passenger Corporation, Mr. James L. Larson, Assistant Vice President Operations and Planning, 60 Massachusetts Avenue, NE., Washington, DC 20002

Central Vermont Railway, Incorporated (CV) and the National Railroad Passenger Corporation jointly seek approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of "Elm Street" Interlocking, milepost 0.0, in St. Albans, Vermont, on the CV Swanton Subdivision, consisting of the following:

1. The removal of the nine controlled interlocking signals, numbers 13LA, 13LB, 13LC, 13R, 15R, 25L, 25RA, 25RB, and 25RC;
2. The conversion of the seven power-operated switches to hand operation; and
3. The installation of one operative approach signal for northward train movements.

The reasons given for the proposed changes is to eliminate facilities no longer required for present day operations and the cost to maintain the aging signal system.

BS-AP—No. 3212

Applicant: Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Mr. W.S. Seery, Director Signal Systems, System Communications and Signal Building, 4515 Kansas Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66106.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company seeks approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of two automatic block signals, numbers 182 and 191, near Eudora, Kansas, milepost 19.08, on the single main track, Eastern Region, Topeka Subdivision.

The reason given for the proposed changes is that the signals are no longer required due to the retirement of the siding at Eudora.

BS-AP—No. 3213

Applicant: Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Mr. W.S. Seery, Director Signal Systems, System Communications and Signal Building, 4515 Kansas Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66106.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company seeks approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of two automatic block signals, numbers 372 and 373, near Lecompton, Kansas, mileposts 37.0 and 38.0, on the single main track, Eastern Region, Topeka Subdivision.

The reason given for the proposed changes is that the signals are no longer required due to the retirement of the siding at Lecompton.

BS-AP—No. 3214

Applicant: Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Mr. W.S. Seery, Director Signal Systems, System Communications and Signal Building, 4515 Kansas Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66106.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company seeks approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of 4 controlled signals (numbers R46, 12R, 12LA, and 12LB) and 13 automatic block signals (numbers 31, 32, 33, 34, 41, 42, 43, R41, 44, 47, 49, 52, and 54), on the two main tracks, between milepost 3.0 and 6.0, near Corwith, Illinois, Eastern Region, Chillicothe Subdivision.

The reason given for the proposed changes is that the signals are no longer required due to changes in operating requirements.

Any interested party desiring to protest the granting of an application shall set forth specifically the grounds upon which the protest is made, and contain a concise statement of the interest of the protestant in the proceeding. The original and two copies of the protest shall be filed with the Associate Administrator for Safety, FRA, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590 within 45 calendar days of the date of issuance of this notice. Additionally, one copy of the protest shall be furnished to the applicant at the address listed above.

FRA expects to be able to determine these matters without oral hearing. However, if a specific request for an oral hearing is accompanied by a showing that the party is unable to adequately present his or her position by written statements, an application may be set for public hearing.

Issued in Washington, DC, on February 1, 1993.

Phil Olekszyk,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety.
[FR Doc. 93-2664 Filed 2-3-93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-06-M

Federal Transit Administration

Environmental Impact Statement, Fixed Guideway Transit System (Tren Urbano), Phase 1, San Juan Metropolitan Area, PR

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Puerto Rico Department of Transportation and Public Works (DTPW), through its agency, the Puerto Rico Highway and Transportation Authority (PRHTA), intend to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), for transportation improvements in the San Juan Metropolitan Area (SJMA). The action to be taken is the construction of Phase 1 of a fixed guideway transit system beginning at the south end of Santurce Ward in the Municipality of San Juan and ending in the Municipality of Bayamon. The action is necessary to reduce traffic congestion, high energy consumption and other impacts of motor vehicle use. The local lead agency (DTPW/PRHTA) will make certain that the EIS also satisfies the requirements of the Puerto Rico Environmental Policy Act (PREPA) and serves as the EIS required by this Act. Besides the light rail alternative, the EIS will evaluate the No Action and Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternatives and any new alternatives generated through the scoping process. Scoping will be accomplished through correspondence with interested persons, organizations and federal, state, and local agencies. The comments received at three public meetings will be considered.

DATES: *Comment Due Date:* Written comments on the scope of alternatives and impacts to be considered should be sent to (in addition to those received at or subsequent to the three public meetings) Mr. Jose S. Rodriguez, Deputy Executive Director for Transportation, Puerto Rico Highway and Transportation Authority, P.O. Box 42007, Minillas Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00940-2007 by March 8, 1993.

Scoping Meetings: Scoping meetings were held at the following locations:

1. Tuesday, October 20, 1992, at 10 a.m. in the Engineers and Surveyors Association Building in Hato Rey Ward, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00918.
2. Wednesday, October 21, 1992, at 10 a.m. in the Bayamon Municipal Assembly Room located at the

intersection of Maceo and Degetau Streets, Bayamon, Puerto Rico 00956.

3. Tuesday, December 1, 1992, at 9 a.m. in the Minillas Government Center Building in Santurce Ward, San Juan, Puerto Rico, 00940-2007.

Transcripts of these meetings are available for review at the PRHTA Environmental Studies Office (see ADDRESSES section below).

ADDRESSES: Written comments concerning the project scope should be sent to Jose S. Rodriguez, Deputy Executive Director for Transportation, Puerto Rico Highway and Transportation Authority, P.O. Box 42007, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00940-42007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Roger H. Krahl, Director, Program Development Staff, Federal Transit Administration, Telephone (404) 347-7875.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

I. Scoping

FTA and the local lead agency invite interested individuals, organizations, and federal, state and local agencies to participate in defining the alternatives to be evaluated in the EIS and defining the alternatives to be evaluated in the EIS and identifying any significant social, economic or environmental issues related to the alternatives. Additional information regarding the proposed project may be obtained by contacting Mr. Jose S. Rodriguez at the address above or by visiting or calling the Environmental Studies Office, located in room 504, 15th Floor, South Building, Minillas Government Center, Santurce, Puerto Rico. The telephone number is (809) 727-6290. Scoping comments made orally at the three public meetings in October and December will be considered. Additional scoping comments may be made in writing. See the ADDRESSES section above. During scoping, comments should focus on identifying specific social, economic or environmental impacts to be evaluated and suggested alternatives that are less costly or less environmentally damaging while achieving similar transit objectives. Scoping is not the appropriate time to indicate preference for a particular alternative. Comments on preference should be communicated after the Draft EIS has been completed. To be placed on the mailing list, contact Mr. Jose S. Rodriguez.

II. Description of Study Area and Project Need

The proposed project consists of 19 kilometers of light transit to be

constructed between Santurce Ward in the Municipality of San Juan and the northwestern part of the Municipality of Bayamon. The guideway will be a sequence of two-track elevated sections and ground sections due to traffic and topographical factors.

The northern terminus of the proposed project is in Santurce Ward, near Sagrado Corazon Street, just north of the Martin Pena Canal. The route will extend southwestward through Hato Rey and Rio Piedras Wards of the Municipality of San Juan. From Rio Piedras Ward, the alignment will take a westerly alignment through the Municipalities of Guaynabo and Bayamon, traversing through the Municipality of Bayamon and ending at Luchetti Industrial Park, east of the PR-5 and PR-28 interchange, for an approximate length of 19 kilometers.

III. Alternatives

Alternatives under consideration include: (1) Building the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) as described above and variations that may arise during the environmental and design process; (2) The No-Build Alternative which will consist of all transit service and highway and transit facilities that now exist or that are included in the Ten Year Plan and will be operational by the year 2010; and, (3) the Bus/TSM Alternative that consists of providing the best transit service that can be reasonably provided without the construction of major transit capital projects such as the fixed guideway system now proposed. This alternative would include TSM measures that are now under study: for example, the provision of an HOV lane in PR-2 between San Juan and Bayamon, and the provision of new bus routes between Carolina and San Juan, and between Bayamon and San Juan. It would also include the reconstruction of several important interchanges on PR-2 in Buchanan and Caparra, the PR-28 and PR-165 interchange in Catano, and the upgrading of a segment of PR-5 in Catano. The construction of a segment of Martinez Nadal Freeway and segments of PR-21, 65th Infantry Freeway in Guaynabo-Bayamon, where a portion of the LPA is planned to be constructed, would also be part of this alternative.

IV. Probable Effects

In the EIS, the FTA and the local lead agency will evaluate all significant social, economic and environmental impacts of the alternatives. Among the primary issues are the expected increases in transit ridership, the capital outlays needed to construct the project,

the cost of operating and maintaining the facilities created by the project, and financial impacts on the funding agencies. Environmental and social impacts proposed for analysis include land use and neighborhood impacts, traffic and parking impacts near stations, visual impacts, impacts on cultural resources, and noise and vibration impacts. Impacts on natural areas, rare and endangered species, air and water quality, groundwater, and geologic forms will also be covered. The impacts will be evaluated both for the construction period and for the long-term period of operation. Measures to mitigate significant adverse impacts will be considered.

V. FTA Procedures

According to the Federal Transit Act, as amended, and FTA policy, the Draft EIS will be prepared in conjunction with an Alternative Analysis, and the Final EIS in conjunction with Preliminary Engineering. After its publication, the Draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment, and a public hearing will be held. On the basis of the Draft EIS and comments received, the Puerto Rico Highway and Transportation Authority will select a locally preferred alternative and seek approval from FTA to continue with Preliminary Engineering and preparation of the Final EIS.

Issued on: February 1, 1993.

Peter N. Stowell,

Regional Federal Transit Administrator.

[FR Doc. 93-2673 Filed 2-3-93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-57-M

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 92-67; Notice 2]

TRW Inc.; Grant of Petition for Determination of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Pursuant to 49 CFR part 556, TRW Inc. (TRW) of Cleveland, Ohio petitioned the agency on behalf of the Quality Safety Systems Company (QSS) of Ontario, Canada, a partnership whose owners are TRW Canada Ltd. and Tokai Rika Co., Ltd. TRW determined that some of the safety belts manufactured by QSS, which are installed on Toyota trucks manufactured by New United Motor Manufacturing, Inc. (NUMMI), fail to comply with the labeling requirements of 49 CFR 571.209, "Seat Belt Assemblies," (Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 209). TRW then filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR part 573.

TRW's petition also asked that NUMMI and Toyota be exempted from the notification and remedy requirements of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 1381 *et seq.*). The basis of the petition was that the noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety.

This notice grants that petition. Notice of receipt of the petition was published on December 7, 1992, and an opportunity afforded for comment (57 FR 57867).

As of October 27, 1992, QSS had found a total of 40 front safety belts which did not comply with the labeling requirements of FMVSS No. 209. Section S4.1(j) of the standard requires that:

[e]ach seat belt assembly shall be permanently and legibly marked or labeled with year of manufacture, model, and name or trademark of manufacturer or distributor, or of importer if manufactured outside the United States.

The model number on the label is different for the different seating positions. In some instances, the label for the right front belt assembly (Model Number 50026N) was inadvertently applied to the left front seat belt assembly (Model Number 50027N). In other instances, the label for the left assembly was inadvertently applied to the right assembly.

TRW supported its petition for inconsequential noncompliance with the following:

The subject seat belt assemblies, while incorrectly labeled, were correctly shipped in containers including only seat belt assemblies for the left or right side, as the case may be. Because of the design of the seat belt assemblies, it would have been very difficult to inadvertently install either of the front seat belt assemblies on the wrong side of the vehicle. Operators at NUMMI have been interviewed and have indicated that they believe it did not occur.

Neither NUMMI nor Toyota is aware of any owner complaints, field reports or allegations of hazardous circumstances relating to either (i) mislabeled seat belt assemblies or (ii) misapplication of seat belt assemblies in Toyota Trucks. In addition, neither NUMMI nor Toyota has found any mislabeled seat belt assembly that was incorrectly installed.

Replacement parts for the subject seat belt assemblies are not distributed through the general automotive after market; they are only sold by Toyota dealers. Toyota dealers utilize a system to obtain replacement parts which is based on part numbers assigned by Toyota. Each seat belt assembly has been assigned a Toyota part number.

The number appearing on the seat belts themselves is not the part number under which the belt is cataloged and sold. If an owner of a Toyota Truck wished to replace a seat belt, he would order it by providing the following information to a Toyota dealer:

"1993 Toyota Truck, seat belt, driver (or passenger) side, color (blue, black, etc.)" and not by the QSS model number appearing on the belt label. The Toyota dealer would look up the proper part number from a parts book, and select the belt from stock (or order it) by the Toyota part number.

The mislabeling in question relates to the QSS model numbers that are printed on the seat belt label. Because Toyota's parts ordering system is based on Toyota's part numbers, it will not be impaired by the subject mislabeling. In support of the foregoing, [TRW] would note that NHTSA recently granted a petition for exemption filed by Chrysler Corporation (Docket No. 92-24). The Chrysler petition concerned 375,000 vehicles which were not marked or labeled in accordance with FMVSS 209. Based on its conclusion that Chrysler's part ordering system would prevent misapplication, NHTSA granted the petition on October 5, 1992 (See 57 FR 45865). TRW would also make reference to comments in support of that petition submitted by both Volkswagen of America, Inc. and the Automotive Occupant Restraints Council."

No comments were received on the TRW petition.

The TRW petition raises two issues. The first of these is whether the improper labeling may have caused NUMMI to install the restraints improperly. TRW stated that it had interviewed the NUMMI personnel who installed the restraints and these persons expressed their belief that the belts were properly installed. Because of the obvious differences between a left and right restraint, and the fact that individuals familiar with safety belt assemblies installed them, NHTSA has concluded that the belts were properly installed.

The second issue is whether an incorrect QSS model number might result in the purchase of the wrong replacement belt. This could result in a delay in installation of a replacement belt, which has a potential adverse effect upon safety. Although the noncompliant belts have reversed model numbers, NHTSA deems it unlikely that confusion will result. As with Chrysler, the structure of Toyota's parts ordering system makes confusion unlikely because Toyota depends on the number that it assigns to the part, instead of on the number assigned by QSS. In summary, when a person obtains replacement restraints through a Toyota dealer, the difference in belt configuration, the structure of the parts ordering system, and comparison of old parts to new ones will all help to assure that the belts are not misapplied.

For the reasons set forth above, NHTSA finds that the petitioner has met its burden of persuasion that the noncompliance herein described is

inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety, and grants its petition.

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 1417; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 49 CFR 501.8.

Issued on: January 29, 1993.

Barry Felrice,

Associated Administrator for Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 93-2590 Filed 2-3-93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Public Information Collection Requirements Submitted to OMB for Review

January 29, 1993.

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 1980, Public Law 96-511. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling the Treasury Bureau Clearance Officer listed. Comments regarding this information collection should be addressed to the OMB reviewer listed and to the Treasury Department Clearance Officer, Department of the Treasury, Room 3171 Treasury Annex, 1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20220.

U.S. Customs Service

OMB Number: 1515-0117.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: Establishment of Container Station.

Description: A container station that is independent of either an importing carrier or a bonded carrier may be established at any port or portion thereof where under the jurisdiction of district director. This information collection is the application to establish such a container station.

Respondents: Businesses or other for-profit.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 177.

Estimated Burden Hours Per

Respondent: 2 hours.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Estimated Total Reporting Burden: 354 hours.

OMB Number: 1515-0133.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: Application to Receive Free Materials in a Bonded Manufacturing Warehouse.

Description: The proprietor of a bonded manufacturing warehouse must make application to the district director to enter into that warehouse any domestic merchandise, except

merchandise which subject to IRS tax, which is to be used in connection with the manufacture of articles permitted to be manufactured.

Respondents: Businesses or other for-profit.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 8.

Estimated Burden Hours Per

Respondent: 30 minutes.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Estimated Total Reporting Burden:

3,000 hours.

Clearance Officer: Ralph Meyer (202)

927-1552, U.S. Customs Service, Paperwork Management Branch, room 6316, 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20229.

OMB Reviewer: Milo Sunderhauf (202)

395-6880, Office of Management and Budget, Room 3001, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Lois K. Holland,

Departmental Reports Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 93-2593 Filed 2-3-93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4820-02-M

Public Information Collection Requirements Submitted to OMB for Review

The Department of the Treasury has submitted the following public information collection requirement(s) to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, Public Law 96-511. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling the Treasury Bureau Clearance Officer listed. Comments regarding this information collection should be addressed to the OMB reviewer listed and to the Treasury Department Clearance Officer, Department of the Treasury, room 3171 Treasury Annex, 1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20220.

SPECIAL REQUEST: The Department is requesting approval of the Internal Revenue Service Survey, described below, by February 12, 1993, in order to implement this study by February 15, 1993. To allow public review and comment on this survey a copy will accompany this notice. Comments should be received by close of business February 10, 1993.

Internal Revenue Service

OMB Number: New

Form Number: None

Type of Review: New collection

Title: Forms Distribution Improvement Survey

Description: The proposed telephone study would be conducted on a national basis and would question individual taxpayers who call the IRS

distribution centers to order tax forms, instructions, and/or publications. This study will attempt to identify taxpayers' actions and habits when filling out their tax returns. Additionally, taxpayers will be questioned to determine if they are willing to provide their social security number when they call to order tax forms. The information collected by this proposed study will allow the IRS to make changes to the forms distribution process that would: (1) Reduce the number of taxpayers having to call the IRS to order additional copies of items, and (2) provide taxpayers with better service.

Respondents: Individuals or households

Estimated Number of Respondents:

2,136

Estimated Burden Hours Per

Respondent: 3 minutes

Frequency of Response: On occasion

Estimated Total Reporting Burden: 1,575 hours

Clearance Officer: Garrick Shear, (202)

535-4297, Internal Revenue Service, room 5571, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20224.

OMB Reviewer: Milo Sunderhauf, (202)

395-6880, Office of Management and Budget, room 3001, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Lois K. Holland,

Departmental Reports Management Officer.

Forms Distribution Improvement Survey

We are trying to gather information that will allow the IRS to improve the service provided by our tax forms distribution channels. Would you help us by taking about 3 minutes of your time to answer some questions?

1. Yes ☐
2. No ☐

1. The tax forms and materials you are ordering will be used: (read first 3 responses to caller)

1. By an Individual Taxpayer ☐
2. By an Accountant or Bookkeeper ☐
3. By a Business ☐
4. Don't Know ☐

* If the caller answered something other than "by individual taxpayer", read this: Thank You for Your Time and Cooperation!! and end the conversation.

2. Did you hire someone (such as an accountant or bookkeeping service) to do your federal income taxes last year (1991 Tax Year)?

1. Yes ☐
2. No ☐
3. Don't Know ☐

3. Did you receive your 1992 tax forms and instruction booklet in the mail?

1. Yes ☐ skip to 6

2. No ☐

3. Don't Know ☐

Only ask the caller questions 4 & 5 if they responded "no" or "don't know" to question 3!

4. Did you receive a post card from the IRS that included a label to use when you file your tax return?

1. Yes ☐ skip to 6

2. No ☐

3. Don't Know ☐

Only ask the caller question 5 if they responded "no" or "don't know" to question 4!

5. Have you moved sometime within the last 12 months?

1. Yes ☐

2. No ☐

3. Don't Know ☐

6. How willing would you be to give your Social Security Number when you call to order tax forms if it would allow us to automatically send them to you in the future? Would you be: (read first 5 responses to caller)

1. Very Willing ☐
2. Willing ☐
3. Neither Willing nor Unwilling ☐
4. Unwilling ☐
5. Very Unwilling ☐
6. Don't Know ☐

7. How many calendar days do you consider to be a reasonable amount of time for it to take to get the tax materials you just ordered? Please stop me when I read the number of days you consider to be reasonable. (read responses until caller stops you)

1. 23 or more days ☐
2. 18-22 days ☐
3. 13-17 days ☐
4. 8-12 days ☐
5. 4-7 days ☐
6. 1-3 days ☐
7. Don't Know ☐

New technologies are available that would allow the IRS to provide tax forms to the public on demand. Because these new technologies are very costly, the IRS would probably charge a fee to obtain forms through them. We would like to see how taxpayers feel about paying a fee to receive tax forms immediately.

This Does Not Mean The IRS Is Going To Start Charging You For Tax Forms.

8. Would you pay between \$.05-\$.25 for each page of a tax form to immediately obtain a copy of the form?

1. Yes ☐ go to 9
2. No ☐ skip to 10
3. Don't Know ☐ skip to 10

Only ask the caller question 9 if they responded "yes" to question 8!

9. What is the maximum amount you would pay per page for the convenience of getting a tax form immediately? (check the "other" box and record the amount if the caller says something other than a listed amount)

1. \$.25 ☐
2. \$.20 ☐
3. \$.15 ☐
4. \$.10 ☐
5. \$.05 ☐
6. Other (Specify) ☐ _____
7. Don't Know ☐

10. How do you make a copy of your income tax return to keep for your records? (read first 5 responses to caller)

1. Keep a Scratch Copy ☐
2. Handwrite or Type an Original ☐
3. Print from Computer ☐
4. Photocopy Forms Sent to IRS ☐
5. Don't Keep a Copy ☐
6. Other (Specify) ☐ _____

11. Did you call to order: (read first 2 responses to caller)

1. Additional Copies of Items You Have ☐
2. Items You Do Not Have ☐
3. Both Responses 1 & 2 ☐
4. Don't Know ☐

12. Do you usually need the same kinds of tax forms and instruction booklets each year?

1. Yes ☐
2. No ☐
3. Don't Know ☐

13. Would you be able to identify ALL of the tax forms and instruction booklets you need for the 1993 tax year when you submit your 1992 tax return?

1. Yes ☐
2. No ☐
3. Don't Know ☐

14. Do you live in a state that has a state income tax?

1. Yes ☐ (Go To 15)
2. No ☐ (Skip to **)
3. Don't Know ☐ (Skip to **)

15. Does your state require you to file a copy of all or part of your federal income tax return along with your state forms?

1. Yes ☐ (Go To 16)
2. No ☐ (Skip to **)
3. Don't Know ☐ (Skip to **)

16. How do you make a copy of your federal tax forms to file with your State income tax return?

1. Send a Scratch Copy ☐
2. Handwrite or Type an Original ☐
3. Print from Computer ☐
4. Photocopy Forms Sent to IRS ☐
5. Don't Send a Copy to State ☐
6. Other (Specify) ☐ _____

17. How would you react to the following statement? Would you:

strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree? If the IRS sent 3 copies of each tax form in my booklet, that would **COMPLETELY ELIMINATE** the need for me to call the IRS to order tax forms and related materials.

1. Strongly Disagree ☐
2. Disagree ☐
3. Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐
4. Agree ☐
5. Strongly Agree ☐
6. Don't Know ☐

** This is the end of the interview. Thank you very much for your time and participation! According to the Paperwork Reduction Act Notice, you can send your comments about the length of the survey to the IRS and the Office of Management and Budget. Do you want me to read the notice and give you the address to send your comments? (If yes, read the box below.)

Paperwork Reduction Act Notice. We ask for this information to carry out the Internal Revenue laws of the United States. Your response is voluntary. The time needed to complete this survey will vary depending on the individual circumstances. The estimated average time is 3 minutes. If you have comments concerning the accuracy of this time estimate or suggestions for making this survey more simple, we would be happy to hear from you. You can write to both the Internal Revenue Service, Washington, DC 20224. Attention: IRS Reports Clearance Officer T:FP; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project; (1545-XXXX); Washington, DC 20503. DO NOT send this survey to either of these offices. Instead use the self-addressed envelope provided.

Assistor Answer—Do Not Ask Caller

Date completed:

Mo. ____ Day ____ Yr. ____
State _____

Taxpayer ordered (check all that apply)

- F1040 ☐
- F1040A ☐
- F1040EZ ☐
- Other Forms/Schedules ☐
- Instructions ☐
- Publications ☐

[FR Doc. 93-2655 Filed 2-3-93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830-01-M

Fiscal Services

[Dept. Circ. 570, 1992 Rev., Supp. No. 10]

Surety Companies Acceptable on Federal Bonds; Century Surety Company

A Certificate of Authority as an acceptable surety on Federal Bonds is hereby issued to the following company

under section 9304 to 9308, title 31, of United States Code. Federal bond-approving officers should annotate their reference copies of Treasury Circular 570, 1992 Revision, on page 29365 to reflect this addition:

Century Surety Company. Business Address: P.O. Box 2689, Columbus, Ohio, 43216-2689. Underwriting Limitation^b: \$504,000. Surety Licenses^c: AZ, IN, OH, WI, WV. Incorporated In: Ohio. Federal Process Agents^d.

Certificates of Authority expire on June 30 each year, unless revoked prior to that date. The Certificates are subject to subsequent annual renewal as long as the companies remain qualified (31 CFR part 223). A list of qualified companies is published annually as of July 1 in Treasury Department Circular 570, with details as to underwriting limitations, areas in which licensed to transact surety business and other information.

Copies of the Circular may be obtained from the Surety Bond Branch, Funds Management Division, Financial Management Service, Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC 20227, telephone (202) 874-6765.

Dated: February 1, 1993

Charles F. Schwan III,

Director, Funds Management Division,
Financial Management Service.

[FR Doc. 93-2649 Filed 2-3-93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-35-M

[Dept. Circ. 570, 1992—Rev., Supp. No. 9]

Surety Companies Acceptable on Federal Bonds; Correction; Contractor's Bonding and Insurance Co.

The above company name was listed in error in the Treasury Department Circular 570, July 1, 1992. The error is hereby corrected to read Contractors Bonding and Insurance Company (Note: The apostrophe in Contractors has been deleted). Federal bond-approving officers should annotate their reference copies of the treasury Circular 570, 1992 Revision, at page 29368 to reflect this change.

Questions concerning this notice may be directed to the Department of the Treasury, Financial Management Service, Funds Management Division, Surety Bond Branch, Washington, DC 20227, telephone (202) 874-6507.

Dated: January 29, 1993.

Charles F. Schwan III,

Director, Funds Management Division,
Financial Management Service.

[FR Doc. 93-2647 Filed 2-3-93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-35-M