strategic national defense needs and for preparing the report to Congress on the status of the Nation's highway bridges and funding under the HBRRP.

Respondents: Transportation agencies of the 50 States and the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

Average Burden per Response: The average burden is two hours per response.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: The estimated total annual burden is 540,000 hours.

Frequency: Annually.

Authority: 23 U.S.C. Sections 144 and 151, and 23 C.F.R. 650.307, 650.311, and 650.407.

Issued On: October 31, 1997.

George Moore,

Associate Administrator for Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–30577 Filed 11–20–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

[FHWA Docket No. 97–3033]

Notice of Request for Renewal of an Existing Information Collection

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the requirement of section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the intention of the FHWA to request the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to renew the information collection identified below under supplementary information.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before January 20, 1998.

ADDRESSES: All signed, written comments should refer to the docket number that appears in the heading of this document and must be submitted to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. All comments received will be available for examination at the above address between 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Those desiring notification of receipt of comments must include a self-addressed, stamped postcard/envelope.

Interested parties are invited to send comments regarding any aspect of this information collection, including, but not limited to: (1) The necessity and utility of the information collection for the proper performance of the functions of the FHWA; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the collected information; and (4) ways to minimize the collection burden without reducing the quality of the collected information. Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB renewal of this information collection.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Jack Wasley, Office of Engineering, 202–366–4658, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Office hours are from 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Preparation and execution of the Project Agreement and Modifications.

OMB Number: 2125–0529.

Background: Under the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 110, a formal agreement between the State highway agency and the FHWA is required for Federal-aid highway projects. This agreement, referred to as the ''project agreement,'' is in essence a written contract between the State and the Federal government defining the extent of the work to be undertaken and commitments made concerning the project.

The requirements covering project agreements are contained in 23 CFR part 630, subpart C.

Respondents: State highway agencies.

Estimated Annual Burden on Respondents: The estimated annual reporting burden is approximately 12,040 hours.

Authority: 23 U.S.C. 110; 23 CFR 630, subpart C.

Issued On: October 31, 1997.

George Moore,

Associate Administrator for Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–30591 Filed 11–20–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–97–3122; Notice 1]

Dan Hill & Associates, Inc.; Petition for Temporary Exemption From Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 224

Dan Hill & Associates, Inc., of Norman, Oklahoma, has petitioned for a one-year temporary exemption from Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 224 *Rear Impact Protection*. The basis of the petition is that compliance would cause substantial economic hardship to a manufacturer that has tried in good faith to comply with the standard.

This notice of receipt of the petition is published in accordance with agency regulations on the subject and does not represent any judgment by the agency about the merits of the petition.

The applicant manufactures and sells a horizontal discharge trailer (''Flow Boy'') that is used in the road construction industry to deliver asphalt and other road building materials to the construction site. The Flow Boy is designed to connect with and latch onto various paving machines (''pavers''). The Flow Boy, with its hydraulically controlled horizontal discharge system, discharges hot mix asphalt at a controlled rate into a paver which overlays the road surface with asphalt material.

Standard No. 224 requires, effective January 26, 1998, that all trailers with a GVWR of 4536 Kg or more, including Flow Boy trailers, be fitted with a rear impact guard that conforms to Standard No. 223 *Rear impact guards*. Installation of the rear impact guard will prevent the Flow Boy from connecting to the paver. Thus, Flow Boy trailers will no longer be functional and contractors will be forced to use standard dump body trucks or trailers with their inherent limitations and safety risks.

The applicant, which manufactured 81 Flow Boy trailers in 1996 (plus 21 other trailers), has asked for a year's exemption in order to explore the feasibility of a rear impact guard that will allow the Flow Boy trailer to connect to a conventional paver. In the absence of an exemption, it believes that approximately 60 percent of its work force would have to be laid off. Its gross revenues would decrease by $6,000,000 (these have averaged $13,885,000 over its 1994, 1995, and 1996 fiscal years). Present studies show that the placement of the retractable rear impact guard would likely catch excess asphalt as it was discharged into the pavement hopper. Further, the increased cost of the Flow Body would likely cause contractors to choose the cheaper alternative of dump trucks. Finally, the increased weight of the retractable rear impact guard would significantly decrease the payload of the Flow Boy.

Applicant sent its Product Specialist to Germany in 1994 to view underride protection guards installed by a German customer on Flow Boy trailers but the technology proved inapplicable because of differences between German and American pavers. Manufacturers of paving machines are not interested in redesigning their equipment to accommodate a Flow Boy with a rear