involved in the effort, few, if any, suitable experts would be available to the U.S. DOT to work on a provisional standard.

Thus, considering the mitigating factors noted above, and supporting the ongoing standard development efforts for the DSRC at 5.9 GHz standard the Secretary of Transportation hereby waives the establishment of a provisional standard. Additionally, by allowing the consensus standards development process to proceed normally, the standards developers will produce more robust standards in the long run. It will give them time to work out practical details and to verify that the standards will lead to economical development of devices that work effectively.

The Secretary will continue to monitor progress on the development of these two critical standards. If, within a six-month period after this waiver, satisfactory progress has not been made on the development of the two standards in question, the Secretary reserves the right to reevaluate the situation and decide whether establishing provisional standards would be beneficial to the goals of the ITS Program and the legislative intent of the TEA–21.

(**Authority:** 23 U.S.C. 315; sec. 5206, Pub. L. 105–178, 112 Stat. 107, 456 (1998); 49 CFR 1.48)

Issued on: April 17, 2001.

Vincent F. Schimmoller,

Deputy Executive Director, Federal Highway Administration.

[FR Doc. 01–9998 Filed 4–20–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[U.S. DOT Docket Number NHTSA–01–9402]

Reports, Forms, and Record Keeping Requirements

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Request for extension of a currently approved collection of information.

SUMMARY: Before a Federal agency can collect certain information from the public, it must receive approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Under procedures established by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before seeking OMB approval, Federal agencies must solicit public comment on proposed collections of information, including extensions and reinstatement of previously approved collections.

This document describes one collection of information for which NHTSA intends to seek OMB approval.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 22, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Comments must refer to the docket notice numbers cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted to Docket Management, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Please identify the proposed collection of information for which a comment is provided, by referencing its OMB clearance number. It is requested, but not required, that 2 copies of the comment be provided. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Complete copies of each request for collection of information may be obtained at no charge from Mr. P. L. Moore, NHTSA 400 Seventh Street, SW., room #5320–C, NPS–32,Washington, DC 20590. Mr. Moore's telephone number is (202) 366–5222. Please identify the relevant collection of information by referring to its OMB Control Number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before an agency submits a proposed collection of information to OMB for approval, it must first publish a document in the **Federal Register** providing a 60-day comment period and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information. The OMB has promulgated regulations describing what must be included in such a document. Under OMB's regulation (at 5 CFR 1320.8(d), an agency must ask for public comment on the following:

(i) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(ii) The accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(iii) How to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(iv) How to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g. permitting electronic submission of responses.

In compliance with these requirements, NHTSA asks for public comments on the following proposed collections of information:

Title: 49 CFR 575–104.

OMB Control Number: 2127–0519.

Affected Public: All passenger car tire manufacturers and brand name owners offering passenger car tires for sale in the United States.

Form Number: This collection of information uses no standard form.

Abstract: Part 575 requires tire manufacturers and tire brand owners to submit reports to NHTSA regarding the UTQGS grades of all passenger car tire lines they offer for sale in the United States. This information is used by consumers of passenger car tires to compare tire quality in making their purchase decisions. The information is provided in several different ways to insure that the consumer can readily see and understand the tire grades: (1) The grades are molded into the sidewall of the tire so that they can be reviewed on both the new tires and the old tires that are to be replaced; (2) a paper label is affixed to the tread face of the new tires that provides the grades of that particular tireline along with an explanation of the grading system; (3) tire manufacturers provide dealers with brochures for public distribution listing the grades of all of the tirelines they offer for sale; and (4) NHTSA compiles the grading information of all manufacturers' tirelines into a booklet that is available to the public both in printed form and on the website.

Estimated Annual Burden to the Manufacturer: NHTSA estimates that a total of 72,450 man-hours are required to write the brochures, engrave the new passenger car tire molds, and affix the paper labels to the tires. Based on an average hourly rate of $18.00 per hour for rubber workers in the United States, the total cost to the manufacturers is $1,304,100.00 to perform those items listed above. The largest portion of the cost burden imposed by the UTQGS program arises from the testing necessary to determine the grades that should be assigned to the tires. An average of 125 convoys, consisting of four vehicles each, are run each year for treadwear testing. NHTSA estimates it cost $0.46 per vehicle mile including salaries, overhead, and reports. This brings the annual treadwear testing cost to $1,656,000.00. For traction testing, it is estimated that 1,500 tires are tested annually with an estimated cost of $33,000 for use of the government test facility. Using a factor of 3.5 times the $33,000 to cover salary and overhead of

test contractors, the estimated cost of traction testing is $115,500. The temperature grade test for tires is an extension of the high speed performance test of 49 CFR 571.109 that is required for safety certification. The additional cost for UTQGS temperature grading is minimal. Thus, the total estimated cost for testing is $1,771,500. The cost of printing the tread labels and brochures is estimated at $900,000. This yields a total annual financial burden of $3,975,600 (approximately $4 million) on the tire manufacturers.

Estimated Annual Burden to the Government: The annual estimated cost of reviewing, storing and displaying the information submissions is 250 man-hours at $10.00 per hour, for a cost of $2,500 per year. Printing and distributing the Consumer Guide to Uniform Tire Quality Grading costs about $5,000 per year. The total cost to the Government runs about $7,500 per year.

Number of Respondents: 130. The actual number of respondents is much less than the 130 individual tire brands. In light of company acquisitions, company mergers, and the actual manufacturers reporting for the various individual brand names that they produce tires for, the actual number of respondents is about 83 individual responses.

Issued on April 17, 2001.

Stephen R. Kratzke,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 01–9995 Filed 4–20–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA 01–9362; Notice 1]

Saleen, Inc.; Receipt of Application for Temporary Exemption From Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 208

Saleen, Inc., of Irvine, California, has applied for a temporary exemption of two years from the automatic restraint requirements of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection.* The basis of the request is that compliance would cause substantial economic hardship to a manufacturer that has tried to comply with the standard in good faith. 49 U.S.C. 30113(b)(3)(B)(i).

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.

Saleen refers to itself as a ''small volume US manufacturer which currently produces the Saleen S281 and the XP8 Explorer.'' Saleen receives completed and certified Mustangs and Explorers from Ford Motor Company drop shipped at the direction of the dealers who own them. Saleen adds a supercharger, makes ''other minor engine modifications, front and rear bumper outer skin designs, the seat trim, [upgrades] the tires, wheels/suspension/brakes, and [adds] appliques to the exterior and interior of the vehicle. Saleen does not make any structural changes to the Mustang or the Explorer.'' Under NHTSA regulations, Saleen is considered an alterer, rather than a manufacturer, since it modifies previously certified vehicles. (See 49 CFR 567.7). Although it may have altered several hundred Ford vehicles in the year preceding the filing of its application, we do not regard Saleen as a ''manufacturer.''

The company now wishes to become a manufacturer of a motor vehicle of its own design. As the vehicle has not entered production, Saleen has manufactured no motor vehicles in the year preceding the filing of its application. The vehicle is called the S7 and is a ''two seat, coupe, sportscar.'' The S7 has been shown in prototype form at automobile shows around the country. The prototype does not fully comply with the lighting requirements of Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 108, *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment,* but Saleen assures us that the next prototype and the production models to follow will meet Standard No. 108 and all other standards as well, with the exception of the automatic restraint requirements of Standard No. 208, paragraph S4.1.5.3.

Saleen has asked for a three-year exemption for the S7 and anticipates that it will sell a total of 112 of them by the end of 2003. According to the petition, preliminary compliance-related development of the S7 was started in July 2000. By the time it filed its petition in December 2000, the company had ''spent an estimated total of 180 man-hours and $18,000 relating to the installation of a driver and passenger side airbag system on the S7.'' The monies spent thus far ''have been in the areas of exterior and interior design necessary for the installation of airbags.'' It has been advised that the airbag development process would cost approximately $1,000,000 not including the cost of test prototype vehicles and airbags, and tooling. This process cannot be completed by the time the company expects to launch the S7, in the summer of 2001. Indeed, the company estimates that it will take up to 20 months to fully develop a system and that the total costs will approach $3,000,000.

Saleen has cumulative net losses before taxes for the past three fiscal years of $9,716,334. It states that it ''simply cannot afford to develop the air bags in either the first (2001)or second (2002) year'' because of these losses. The company ''has exhausted all of its borrowing capacity and must sell and ship S7 vehicles (as well as its other products) to generate cash flow sufficient to defray airbag development costs as well as other S7 development costs.'' Although ''funding for the S7 was secured through a private investor,'' it states that ''all further funding for airbags must come from our ordinary income.'' Even with an exemption, Saleen projects net losses continuing through the end of the period though earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization would be positive. It plans to spread out air bag development costs over the next three years to achieve compliance by the end of the exemption period. If the petition is denied, the company believes that it would lose credibility with dealers and negatively impact the demand for altered Saleen vehicles.

The company argues that a temporary exemption is in the public interest because the S7 ''is a unique super car designed and produced in the US utilizing many US sourced components.'' An exemption would also allow it to maintain its payroll of 122 full time employees and to continue its purchase of US sourced components for the Mustangs and Explorers that it modifies. Its business with US suppliers ''indirectly provides employment for several hundred other Americans.'' An exemption is consistent with vehicle safety objectives because the S7 otherwise will conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

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 10:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. To the extent