is not a consensus standard applicable to overloaded manufactured home tires. The FMCSA's actions have not undermined or compromised the interchangeability standards of the Tire and Rim Association. The tire overloading rule relates solely to the manner in which motor carriers use manufactured home tires, an issue that association never attempted to address. The FMCSA has not violated the NTTA.

With regard to Multinational's concerns about the public interest, the FMCSA worked with HUD to require the manufactured housing industry to alter its practice of overloading tires by up to 50 percent above the tire manufacturer's load rating. The agencies have reduced the amount of overloading to 18 percent presently, and through the denial of the MHI's petition, transporters of manufactured homes would be prohibited from overloading tires. Transporters of manufactured homes would be required to adhere to the same standards as anyone else subject to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations. The delay in the termination date does not, in and of itself, change the substance of 49 CFR 393.75(g).

Through this notice the agency is making clear its preliminary intention not to grant the MHI's petition to allow 18 percent overloading on a permanent basis. The agency intends to bring to an end the industry practice of transporting manufactured homes on overloaded tires, albeit approximately 13 months later than originally planned. The agency does not believe the delay in the termination date is contrary to the public interest because the level of safety provided by the November 21, 2000, final rule is no different than the level of safety provided prior to the delay.

Request for Comments

The FMCSA requests comments from all interested parties concerning overloading of tires used in the transportation of manufactured homes. The agency encourages commenters to discuss any of the specific issues mentioned above and any other issues the commenters believe may be relevant. Depending on the comments received, the agency will issue a notice denying the MHI's and Multinational's petitions.

Issued on: April 16, 2001.

Julie Anna Cirillo,

Acting Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 01–9867 Filed 4–19–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

[FTA Docket No. FTA–2001–9446]

Notice of Request for Approval of a New Collection

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the intention of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to request the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to approve the following new information collection: 49 CFR Part 611 Major Capital Investment Projects.

DATES: Comments must be submitted before June 19, 2001.

ADDRESSES: All written comments must refer to the docket number that appears at the top of this document and be submitted to the United States Department of Transportation, Central Dockets Office, PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. All comments received will be available for examination at the above address from 10 a.m. to 5 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.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. John Day, Office of Budget and Policy, (202) 366–1671.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Interested parties are invited to send comments regarding any aspect of this information collection, including: (1) The necessity and utility of the information collection for the proper performance of the functions of the FTA; (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 approval of this information collection.

Title: 49 CFR Part 611 Major Capital Investment Projects.

Background: On June 9, 1998, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA–21) (Pub. L. 105–178) was enacted. Section 3009(e)(5) of TEA–21 requires FTA to issue regulations on the manner in which candidate projects for capital investment grants and loans for new fixed guideway systems and extensions to existing systems (''new starts'') will be evaluated and rated for purposes of the FTA Capital Investment Grants and Loans program for new starts under 49 USC Section 5309.

The Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) for this regulation was issued on April 7, 1999, (64 FR 17062). The docket was open for public comment through July 6, 1999, though late-filed comments were accepted through July 19, 1999. Comments were received from a total of 41 individuals and organizations. During the comment period, FTA held three additional public outreach workshops to solicit comments on the proposed rule: one in Toronto, Ontario, on May 24, 1999, in conjunction with the 1999 American Public Transit Association's Commuter Rail/Rapid Transit Conference; one in Oakland, California, on June 3, 1999; and one in Washington, D.C., on June 8, 1999. Notes from these workshops have been placed in the docket for this rule (Docket No. FTA–99–5474–48).

The Final Rule was issued on December 7, 2000, (65 FR 76864) noting that a separate burden analysis would be published for public comment and that FTA would seek a control number from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) authorizing FTA to collect the required information. This notice serves that purpose.

It is important to note that while the new starts project evaluation and rating regulation is new, the requirements for project evaluation and data collection for the new starts program are not. FTA's requirement to evaluate proposed new starts against a prescribed set of statutory criteria is longstanding. The Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987 (STURAA) established in law a set of criteria that proposed projects had to meet in order to be eligible for federal funding. The requirement for summary project ratings has been in place since 1998.

In general, the information used by FTA for new starts project evaluation and rating purposes should arise as a part of the normal planning process. Prior to this Rule, FTA collected project evaluation information from project sponsors under a Paperwork Reduction Act request (OMB No. 2132–0529) approved under the joint FTA/FHWA planning regulations. However, as the project evaluation criteria have expanded under TEA–21, it has become apparent that some information required under this Rule may be beyond the scope of ordinary planning activities. Further, while FTA has long required the reporting of information for project evaluations, there has never been a regulatory requirement until TEA–21. Finally, this Rule adds a new

requirement for before-and-after data collection for purposes of Government Performance and Results Act reporting as a condition of obtaining a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA). Therefore, FTA is submitting a separate Paperwork Reduction Act request.

It is also important to note that since this is a new regulatory requirement, the burden estimates include all data collection efforts required by this Rule, regardless of whether or not the same data would have been required under the previous, policy statement-driven process. Thus, the total burden estimate includes items that would have been required whether this regulation had been issued or not. These estimates were also provided in the preamble to the Final Rule dated December 7, 2000.

Respondents: State and local government.

Estimated Annual Burden on Respondents: 487 hours for each of the 97 respondents.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 47,200 hours.

Frequency: Annual.

Issued: April 13, 2001.

Dorrie Y. Aldrich,

Associate Administrator for Administration.

[FR Doc. 01–9743 Filed 4–19–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–57–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA 2001–9430; Notice 1]

Bajaj Auto, Ltd.; Receipt of Application for Temporary Exemption From Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 123

Bajaj Auto, Ltd., an Indian corporation, through Rex Products, Inc. of South San Francisco, CA, dba Bajaj USA, has applied for a temporary exemption of two years from a requirement of S5.2.1 (Table 1) of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 123 *Motorcycle Controls and Displays.* The basis of the request is that ''compliance with the standard would prevent the manufacturer from selling a motor vehicle with an overall safety level at least equal to the overall safety level of nonexempt vehicles,'' 49 U.S.C. 30113(b)(3)(B)(iv).

We are publishing this notice of receipt of an application in accordance with the requirements of 49 U.S.C. 30113(b)(2). This action does not represent any judgment of the agency on the merits of the application.

Bajaj has applied on behalf of its Saffire motor scooters (''scooters'') with automatic clutches. The scooters are defined as ''motorcycles'' for purposes of compliance with the Federal motor vehicle safety standards. According to Bajaj, the Saffire has a 90cc engine and a top speed of 60 km/h.

If a motorcycle is produced with rear wheel brakes, S5.2.1 of Standard No. 123 requires that the brakes be operable through the right foot control, though the left handlebar is permissible for motor driven cycles (Item 11, Table 1). Bajaj would like to use the left handlebar for the rear brake control for the scooters. Standard No. 123 specifies the left handlebar as the location for the manual clutch or integrated clutch and gear change, but there is no clutch on the automatic scooters.

Bajaj argues that the overall level of safety of the scooters equals or exceeds that of a motorcycle that complies with the brake control location requirement of Standard No. 123. Although ''it is true that the human foot can apply much more force than can the hand, the foot is much less sensitive to travel distance. With the lever/cable operated brake system used on the Saffire, there is more than enough brake actuation force available to the hand of even the smallest rider.''

Bajaj intends to begin sales in the United States ''for market testing purposes during the 2001 sales year'' and would like to include the Saffire in its product line; without an exemption it would be unable to do so.

Bajaj anticipates sales of not more than 2500 scooters a year while an exemption is in effect. It believes that an exemption would be in the public interest and consistent with the objectives of traffic safety because it is intended for low-speed urban use, in ''congested traffic conditions,'' and ''has been tested by long use in India and the rest of the world.'' The petitioner states that ''neither consumer groups nor governmental authorities have raised any safety concerns as a result of this design.'' The scooter provides ''environmentally clean and fuel efficient * * * urban transportation.'' Specifically, ''the exhaust, crankcase, and evaporative emissions of the motor scooter's very small engine have been demonstrated to be lower than alternative means of transportation such as large motorcycles.'' If the exemption is granted, ''the American consumer will be provided with a broader range of choice of low-cost, efficient, transportation.''

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on the application described above. Comments should refer to the docket number and the notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. It is requested but not required that 10 copies be submitted.

All comments received before the close of business on the comment closing date indicated below will be considered, and will be available for examination in the docket at the above address both before and after that date. The Docket Room is open from 10 a.m. until 5 p.m. To the extent possible, comments filed after the closing date will also be considered.

Notice of final action on the application will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

Comment closing date: May 21, 2001.

(49 U.S.C. 30113; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50. and 501.8)

Issued on April 17, 2001.

Stephen R. Kratzke,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 01–9840 Filed 4–19–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Docket No. AB–33 (Sub–No. 177X)]

Union Pacific Railroad Company—Abandonment Exemption—in Davis County, UT

Union Pacific Railroad Company (UP) has filed a notice of exemption under 49 CFR 1152 Subpart F—*Exempt Abandonments and Discontinuances of Service and Trackage Rights* to abandon a 1.082-mile line of railroad over the Syracuse Industrial Lead from milepost 1.10 to milepost 2.182 near Clearfield, Davis County, UT. The line traverses United States Postal Service Zip Code 84015.

UP has certified that: (1) No local traffic has moved over the line for at least 2 years; (2) there is no overhead traffic moving over the line; (3) no formal complaint filed by a user of rail service on the line (or by a state or local government entity acting on behalf of such user) regarding cessation of service over the line either is pending with the Surface Transportation Board (Board) or with any U.S. District Court or has been decided in favor of complainant within the 2-year period; and (4) the requirements at 49 CFR 1105.7 (environmental reports), 49 CFR 1105.8 (historic reports), 49 CFR 1105.11 (transmittal letter), 49 CFR 1105.12 (newspaper publication), and 49 CFR 1152.50(d)(1) (notice to governmental agencies) have been met.