Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before July 5, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Arthur Winder, Project Manager, Washington Airports District Office, 23723 Air Freight Lane, Suite 210, Dulles, VA 22016.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Bryan O. Elliott, Director of Aviation, of the Charlottesville-Albemarle Airport Authority at the following address: Charlottesville-Albemarle Airport, 201 Bowen Loop, Charlottesville, Virginia 22901.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the Charlottesville-Albemarle Airport Authority under § 158.23 of part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Arthur Winder, Program Manager, Wahington Airports District Office, 23723 Air Freight Lane, Suite 210, Dulles, VA 22016, (703) 661–1363. The application may be reviewed in person at this same location.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC at Charlottesville-Albemarle Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Pub. L. 101–508) and part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

On May 10, 2001, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by Charlottesville-Albemarle Airport Authority was substantially complete within the requirements of § 158.25 of part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than August 15, 2001.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

PFC Application No.: 01–14–C–00–CHO.

Level of the proposed PFC: $3.00.

Proposed charge effective date: July 1, 2004.

Proposed charge expiration date: January 1, 2005.

Total estimated PFC revenue: $220,000.

Brief description of proposed project(s):

Extend Runway 3 Safety Area, Phase III (Impose & Use)

PFC Project Administration Fees (Impose & Use)

Air Carrier Terminal Refurbishment (Design) Phase II (Impose & Use)

Acquire Snow Removal Equipment Carrier Vehicle (Impose & Use)

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: Air Taxi/Commercial Operators filing FAA Form 1800–31 and foreign air carriers.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** and at the FAA regional Airports Office located at: Federal Aviation Administration, Airports Division, AEA–610, 1 Aviation Plaza, Jamaica, NY 11434–4809.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Charlottesville-Albemarle Airport.

Issued in Dulles, Va. 22016, May 24, 2001.

Terry J. Page,

Manager, Washington Airports District Office.

[FR Doc. 01–14109 Filed 6–4–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

Environmental Impact Statement on the Central Corridor Project Located Between Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minnesota

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration (FTA), DOT.

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

SUMMARY: The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is issuing this notice to advise interested agencies and the public that, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is being prepared for the Central Corridor Transit Project located between Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minnesota.

DATES: One Interagency Scoping Meeting and two Public Scoping Meetings will be held on the following dates and times at the locations indicated.

Interagency Scoping Meeting

Tuesday, June 26, 2001, from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., Sheraton Midway, 400 North Hamline Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota 55104,

Public Scoping Meetings

Tuesday, June 26, 2001, 8:00 a.m. to 9:30 a.m., Sheraton Midway, 400 North Hamline Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota 55104

Tuesday, June 26, 2001, 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Lifetrack Resources Job Search Center, 709 University Avenue West, St. Paul, Minnesota 55104

Wednesday, June 27, 2001, 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Radisson Metrodome, 615 Washington Avenue SE., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

ADDRESSES: Written comments on the scope of the analysis and impacts to be considered should be sent by July 20, 2001 to: Mr. Steve Morris, Project Manager, Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority (RCRRA), 50 West Kellogg Boulevard, Suite 665, St. Paul, Minnesota 55102, Telephone: (651) 266–2784, Fax: (651) 266–2761, E-mail: steve.morris@co.ramsey.mn.us, TDD: 1 800 627–3529.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Joel P. Ettinger, Regional Administrator, Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Region V, 200 West Adams Street, Suite 2410, Chicago, Illinois 60606, Telephone: (312) 353–2789.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FTA (the federal lead agency for this action) in cooperation with the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority (RCRRA), the local lead agency, will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Central Corridor Transit Project.

I. Scoping

The FTA and the RCRRA invite interested individuals, organizations and federal, state and local agencies to participate in: defining the options to be evaluated in the EIS; in identifying the social, economic and environmental impacts to be evaluated; and suggesting alternative options that are less costly or have fewer environmental impacts while achieving similar transportation objectives. An information packet, referred to as the Scoping Booklet is being circulated to all federal, state and local agencies having jurisdiction in the project, and all interested parties currently on the RCRRA mailing list. Other interested parties may request this Scoping Booklet by contacting Steve Morris at the address indicated above.

Three Public Scoping Meetings will be held in the study area. The first will be held from 8:00 to 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 26, 2001, at the Sheraton Midway, 400 North Hamline Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota. The second will be held from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 26, 2001, at the Lifetrack Resources Job Search Center, 709 University Avenue West, St. Paul, Minnesota. The third Public Scoping Meeting will be held from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Wednesday, June 27, 2001,

at the Radisson Metrodome, 615 Washington Avenue Southeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota. One Interagency Scoping Meeting will be held from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 26, 2001, at the Sheraton Midway, 400 North Hamline Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota. People with special needs should call Steve Morris at (651) 266–2784. The buildings are accessible to persons with disabilities.

Scoping comments may be made orally at the Public Scoping Meetings or in writing by July 20, 2001. Comments or questions should be directed to Mr. Steve Morris at the address indicated above.

II. Description of the Study Area and Transportation Needs

The Central Corridor study area is described as the 11-mile corridor extending between Minneapolis and Saint Paul, Minnesota on the west and east, and bounded by the Burlington Northern-Santa Fe (BNSF) Northern Mainline on the north and the Canadian Pacific Railroad (CP Railway) Shortline Railroad on the south. The proposed Central Corridor would connect the central business districts of Minneapolis and St. Paul, and the University of Minnesota, and would serve the transit-dependent population located within the study area.

Throughout the last two decades, the Central Corridor has been the focus of several studies regarding the feasibility of various mass transit modes. Each of these studies has identified the Central Corridor as the region's priority corridor for mass transit investment. The current 2020 Long-Range Transportation Plan and the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) both include funding commitments for the Central Corridor Project.

In February 2000, the RCRRA initiated the Central Corridor Transit Study to identify the mass transit options for the Central Corridor. Preliminary phases of the study identified the purpose and need for transportation improvements in the corridor and identified and screened potential mass transit options that would meet the purpose and need. The purpose and need for transportation improvements in the study area were focused on three principal areas: economic opportunity and investment; communities and environment; and transportation and mobility. Following a multiple-phase screening process, it was determined that the potential mass transit options that would address the purpose and need for the Central Corridor included: Light Rail Transit (LRT); Busway/ Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), and Commuter Rail.

Although two commuter rail options were being considered during the preliminary phases of the Central Corridor Transit Study, the evaluation of the commuter rail options will be deferred to a separate environmental document based on regional commuter rail connections and system planning, funding and operating agency responsibility.

A public involvement program has been developed and initiated with a website, newsletters, informational meetings, and public hearings.

III. Alternatives

The transit modes initially considered for the Central Corridor included: Bus Transit, Busway/Bus Rapid Transit, Light Rail Transit, Commuter Rail, Streetcar, Heavy Rail Transit, Monorail, Automated Guideway Transit, Personal Rapid Transit, and Magnetic Levitation. The seven route alignments initially studied were the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Northern Mainline, the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Southern Mainline, the Pierce Butler Route, University Avenue, I–94, the Canadian Pacific Rail, and the Canadian Pacific Rail West.

The transportation alternatives currently proposed for consideration for the Central Corridor Draft EIS include:

1. *No-Build Alternative*—No change to transportation services or facilities in the Central Corridor beyond already committed projects. This includes only those roadway and transit improvements defined in the appropriate agencies' Long Range Transportation Plans and Transit Development Plans for which funding has been committed.

2. *Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative*—Low cost transportation infrastructure and bus transit improvements for the Central Corridor. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), Travel Demand Management (TDM), bus operations and other TSM improvements will be included in this alternative.

3. *Busway/Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Alternative*—A Busway/Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) line to be constructed with several station stops between downtown Minneapolis, the University of Minnesota and downtown St. Paul, primarily in exclusive guideway in the center of University Avenue. The alternative would include all facilities associated with the construction and operations of the Busway/BRT, including right-of-way, structures, and stations, as well as Busway/BRT, feeder bus and rail operating plans. The Busway/BRT alternative would also incorporate the elements of the No-Build and TSM alternatives.

4. *Light Rail Transit (LRT) Alternatives*—A Light Rail Transit (LRT) line to be constructed with several station stops between downtown Minneapolis, the University of Minnesota and downtown St. Paul, on either University Avenue or I–94. Both the University Avenue and I–94 LRT alternative would incorporate the elements of the No-Build and TSM alternatives.

The I–94 LRT Alternative would provide LRT service, primarily in barrier-separated exclusive lanes in the median of I–94. The alternative would include all facilities associated with the construction and operations of the LRT, including right-of-way, tracks, structures, and stations, as well as LRT, feeder bus and rail operating plans.

The University Avenue LRT Alternative would provide LRT service, primarily in exclusive lanes in the center of University Avenue. The alternative would include all facilities associated with the construction and operations of the LRT, including right-of-way, tracks, structures, and stations, as well as LRT, feeder bus and rail operating plans.

IV. Probable Effects/Potential Impacts for Analysis

The FTA and the RCRRA will consider probable effects and potentially significant impacts to social, economic and environmental factors associated with the alternatives under evaluation in the EIS. Potential environmental issues to be addressed will include: Land use, historic and archaeological resources, traffic and parking, noise and vibration, environmental justice, regulatory floodway/floodplain encroachments, coordination with transportation and economic development projects, and construction impacts. Other issues to be addressed in the EIS include: natural areas, ecosystems, rare and endangered species, water resources, air/surface water and groundwater quality, energy, potentially contaminated sites, displacements and relocations, and parklands. The potential impacts will be evaluated for both the construction period and the long-term operations period of each alternative considered. In addition, the cumulative effects of the proposed project alternatives will be identified. Measures to avoid or mitigate any significant adverse impacts will be developed.

V. FTA Procedures

In accordance the regulations and guidance established by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), as well as the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 23, Part 771 (23 CFR 771) of the FHWA/FTA environmental regulations and policies, the EIS will include an analysis of the social, economic and environmental impacts of each of the alternatives selected for evaluation. The EIS will also comply with the requirements of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) and with Executive Order 12898 regarding Environmental Justice. After its publication, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) will be available for public and agency review and comment. Public hearings will be held on the DEIS.

The Final EIS will consider comments received during the DEIS public review and will identify the preferred alternative. Opportunity for additional public comment will be provided throughout all phases of project development.

Issued on: May 30, 2001.

Joel P. Ettinger,

Region 5 Administrator, Federal Transit Administration, Chicago, Illinois.

[FR Doc. 01–14102 Filed 6–4–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–57–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2001–9732]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1993 Ford Mustang Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1993 Ford Mustang passenger cars are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This document announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that 1993 Ford Mustang passenger cars that were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are eligible for importation into the United States because (1) they are substantially similar to vehicles that were originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States and that were certified by their manufacturer as complying with the safety standards, and (2) they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the petition is July 5, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to the docket number and notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh St., SW, Washington, DC 20590. [Docket hours are from 9 am to 5 pm.]

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: George Entwistle, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202–366–5306).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A), a motor vehicle that was not originally manufactured to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards shall be refused admission into the United States unless NHTSA has decided that the motor vehicle is substantially similar to a motor vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States, certified under 49 U.S.C. 30115, and of the same model year as the model of the motor vehicle to be compared, and is capable of being readily altered to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Petitions for eligibility decisions may be submitted by either manufacturers or importers who have registered with NHTSA pursuant to 49 CFR part 592. As specified in 49 CFR 593.7, NHTSA publishes notice in the **Federal Register** of each petition that it receives, and affords interested persons an opportunity to comment on the petition. At the close of the comment period, NHTSA decides, on the basis of the petition and any comments that it has received, whether the vehicle is eligible for importation. The agency then publishes this decision in the **Federal Register**.

Wallace Environmental Testing Laboratories, Inc. of Houston, Texas (''WETL'') (Registered Importer 90–005) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1993 Ford Mustang passenger cars originally manufactured for the European market are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles which WETL believes are substantially similar are 1993 Ford Mustang passenger cars that were manufactured for importation into, and sale in, the United States and certified by their manufacturer as conforming to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared non-U.S. certified 1993 Ford Mustang passenger cars to their U.S.-certified counterparts, and found the vehicles to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

WETL submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 1993 Ford Mustang passenger cars, as originally manufactured, conform to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as their U.S. certified counterparts, or are capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that non-U.S. certified 1993 Ford Mustang passenger cars are identical to their U.S. certified counterparts with respect to compliance with Standard Nos. 102 *Transmission Shift Lever Sequence * * *,* 103 *Defrosting and Defogging Systems,* 104 *Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems,* 105 *Hydraulic Brake Systems*, 106 *Brake Hoses,* 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment,* 109 *New Pneumatic Tires,* 111 *Rearview Mirror*, 113 *Hood Latch Systems,* 114 *Theft Protection,* 116 *Brake Fluid*, 118 *Power Window Systems*, 124 *Accelerator Control Systems,* 201 *Occupant Protection in Interior Impact,* 202 *Head Restraints,* 204 *Steering Control Rearward Displacement,* 205 *Glazing Materials*, 206 *Door Locks and Door Retention Components,* 207 *Seating Systems*, 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*, 209 *Seat Belt Assemblies,* 210 *Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages,* 212 *Windshield Retention*, 214 *Side Impact Protection,* 216 *Roof Crush Resistance,* 219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion,* 301 *Fuel System Integrity*, and 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials*.

Additionally, the petitioner states that non-U.S. certified 1993 Ford Mustang passenger cars comply with the Bumper Standard found in 49 CFR part 581 and the Vehicle Identification Number plate requirement of 49 CFR part 565.

Petitioner also contends that the non-U.S. certified 1993 Ford Mustang passenger cars are not identical to their U.S. certified counterparts, as specified below, but still comply with the following Standard in the manner indicated:

Standard No. 101 *Controls and Displays*: the speedometer indicates both kilometers per hour and mile per hour. The odometer indicates kilometers and is labeled as such. The brake warning indicator meets the requirements.

Petitioner further contends that the vehicles are capable of being readily