size tire at 2,180 kg (4,805 pounds) for the load range F tires mounted on 15 degree drop center rims, whereas the GB 9744 document lists the value of the maximum load rating at 2,160 kg (4,752 pounds), according to the petitioner, or 20 kg pounds less than the TRA value.

The petition states that the two subject tire sizes are used in the intermodal transportation industry on dual axle, dual wheel (8 tires and rims) trailers and container chassis with a total load rating for the two axles of 15,455 kg (34,000 pounds). Based on the maximum tire load rating, the TRA maximum load capacity for eight 10–20 or 11–22.5 bias ply, load range F tires is 17,436 kg (38,440 pounds) and the maximum load capacity for eight similar tires based on the GB 9744 data obtained from the petitioner is 17,280 kg (38,016 pounds). Both load capacities are, according to the petitioner, well above the maximum allowable load limit (34,000 pounds) for the intermodal trailers and container chassis. The petitioner further stated that the small difference in maximum load rating between the GB 9744 and the TRA specifications is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

FMVSS No. 119 establishes the safety performance requirements for tires used on vehicles other than passenger cars. The requirements for tire endurance, strength, high speed performance, treadwear indicators, and tire markings are specified in paragraph S6 of the standard and are tested in accordance with the conditions and procedures specified in paragraph S7.

Paragraph S5.1(b) of FMVSS No. 119 lists the publications that may be used by tire manufacturers for rim matching, tire size, and maximum tire load rating with corresponding inflation pressure. Paragraph S6.6, Maximum load rating, requires that the maximum load rating labeled on a tire in accordance with paragraph S6.5, Tire markings, meet or exceed the lowest load rating value specified in the publications listed in Section 5.1(b) for that tire size.

B. Discussion

FMVSS No. 119 allows tire manufacturers to use any one of the seven publications in S5.1(b) to obtain rim, and tire load and inflation pressure information for the labeling requirements of paragraph S6.5.

The petitioner provided one page of the GB 9744 publication, which included one of the two bias ply tire sizes discussed in the petition. The agency does not recognize specifications for one or two tire sizes from a technical reference year book, but would consider recognition of an entire standardization publication.

If the organization that publishes GB 9744 would like its publication to be considered for inclusion in the list of publications in FMVSS No. 119, paragraph S5.1(b), that organization is invited to submit information to NHTSA. The type of information contained in these publications includes its membership, objectives, and the organizations that provide technical support, in addition to its tire and rim specifications. PCR submitted a petition for rulemaking requesting that GB 9744 maximum tire load ratings for two tire sizes be accepted by NHTSA. However, PCR did not indicate whether it had any communication with the organization that publishes GB 9744 prior to submitting the petition. NHTSA does not consider recognizing tire standardization organizations upon the request of tire distributors.

The petitioner believes that the agency is accepting tire markings (paragraph S6.5, Tire markings) from sources that are not on the list in paragraph S5.1(b). The agency does not accept tire maximum load ratings that do not comply with the requirements in paragraph S6.6, which state that the maximum load rating for a particular tire size must be equal to or greater than the lowest maximum load rating for that tire size published in the list of technical reference year books in paragraph S5.1(b).

C. Agency Determination

After review of the tire specifications from the sources listed in FMVSS No. 119, the Scandinavian Tire and Rim Technical Organization publication has the lowest values for the maximum load rating of the 10–20 size tire with 2,305 kg (5,071 pounds) for the single application rating and 2,120 kg (4,664 pounds) for the dual rating. The GB 9744 values for the maximum load rating for 10–20 bias ply tire, load range F, 2,465 kg (5,434 pounds) for the single rating and 2,160 kg (4,752 pounds) for the dual rating, are greater than the values specified in the Scandinavian Tire and Rim Technical Organization publication for that size tire. Tire manufacturers may label the 10–20 size tires with the GB 9744 value for the rated maximum load without violating the requirements of FMVSS No. 119, S6.6 Maximum load rating. Therefore, PCR's petition is moot with regard to the 10–20 tire size.

The Tire and Rim Association value for maximum load rating is the lowest value for 11–22.5 size tires 2,180 kg (4,805 pounds) specified in the publications listed in paragraph S5.1(b) of FMVSS No. 119. The documents forwarded to the agency by the petitioner do not include maximum load data for the 11–22.5 tire size, but NHTSA was informed by the petitioner that the 11–22.5 tire size has the same maximum load rating as the 10–20 tire size. Therefore, labeling an 11–22.5 size tire with the GB 9744 value for maximum load rating would not comply with the standard as currently written.

The PCR petition with respect to the 11–22.5 size tires is denied because the agency does not consider adding specifications for a single tire size to the accepted reference documents in paragraph S5.1(b) of FMVSS No. 119.

Issued: March 6, 2007.

Stephen R. Kratzke,

Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. E7–4301 Filed 3–9–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration Office of Hazardous Materials Safety; Notice of Delays in Processing of Special Permit Applications

AGENCY: Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: List of Applications Delayed more than 180 days.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the requirements of 49 U.S.C. 5117(c), PHMSA is publishing the following list of special permit applications that have been in process for 180 days or more. The reason(s) for delay and the expected completion date for action on each application is provided in association with each identified application.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ann Mazzullo, Office of Hazardous Materials Special Permits and Approvals, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001, (202) 366–4535.

Key to ''Reason for Delay''

1. Awaiting additional information from applicant.

2. Extensive public comment under review.

3. Application is technically complex and is of significant impact or precedent-setting and requires extensive analysis.

4. Staff review delayed by other priority issues or volume special permit applications.

Meaning of Application Number Suffixes

N—New application

M—Modification request

X—Renewal

PM—Party to application with modification request

Issued in Washington, DC, on March 6, 2007.

Delmer F. Billings,

Director, Office of Hazardous Materials Safety, Special Permits & Approvals.

Application No.	Applicant	Reason for delay	Estimated date of completion
New Special Permit Applications			
14314–N	North American Automotive Hazmat Action Committee	1	07–31–2007
14330–N	Chemical & Metal Industries, Inc., Hudson, Co	4	03–31–2007
14343–N	Valero St. Charles, Norco, LA	1	04–30–2007
14385–N	Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Kansas City, MO	4	03–31–2007
14397–N	UltraCell Corporation, Livermore, CA	1	03–31–2007
14402–N	Lincoln Composites, Lincoln, NE	1	12–31–2007
14398–N	Lyondell Chemical Company, Houston, TX	4	03–31–2007
Modification to Special Permits			
10481–M	M–Engineering Limited, Bradford, West Yorkshire	4	03–31–2007
11447–M	SAES Pure Gas, Inc., San Louis Obispo, CA	4	03–31–2007

[FR Doc. 07–1130 Filed 3–9–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–60–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Ex Parte No. 671]

Rail Capacity and Infrastructure Requirements

AGENCY: Surface Transportation Board, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of public hearing.

SUMMARY: The Surface Transportation Board will hold a public hearing beginning at 9 a.m. on Wednesday, April 11, 2007, at its new offices in Washington, DC. The purpose of the public hearing will be to examine issues related to rail traffic forecasts and infrastructure requirements. Persons wishing to speak at the hearing should notify the Board in writing.

DATES: The public hearing will take place on Wednesday, April 11, 2007. Any person wishing to speak at the hearing should file with the Board a written notice of intent to participate, and should identify the party, the proposed speaker, the time requested, and the topic(s) to be covered, as soon as possible but no later than March 21, 2007. Each speaker should also file with the Board his/her written testimony by April 4, 2007. Written submissions by interested persons who do not wish to appear at the hearing will also be due by April 4, 2007.

ADDRESSES: All notices of intent to participate and testimony may be submitted either via the Board's e-filing format or in the traditional paper format. Any person using e-filing should comply with the Board's *http://www.stb.dot.gov* Web site, at the ''E-FILING'' link. Any person submitting a filing in the traditional paper format should send an original and 10 copies of the filing to: Surface Transportation Board, Attn: STB Ex Parte No. 671, 395 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20423–0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph H. Dettmar, (202) 245–0395. [Assistance for the hearing impaired is available through the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at: (800) 877–8339.]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In recent years, there has been growing recognition that rail capacity in the United States has become constrained. Those capacity constraints come at the same time as many forecasts predict that rail freight demands will continue to grow over the next twenty years. Railroads experienced a more than 50% increase in traffic from 1990 to 2003, and traffic is projected to continue to increase as the economy grows.[1] Some forecasters predict that multimodal freight tonnage in the United States will rise by nearly 70% between 1998 and 2020.[2] The convergence of increased demand with constrained capacity has highlighted the need to address what further infrastructure investment will be required to meet these demands. While some railroads have announced significant infrastructure investment plans, some observers have questioned whether that investment alone will be sufficient to meet the rail transport needs of a growing economy.

In regulating the railroad industry, the Board is called upon, among other things, to ensure the development and continuation of a sound rail transportation system with effective competition and coordination between rail carriers and other modes. Pursuant to that objective, the Board will hold a public hearing as a forum for interested persons to provide views and information about: Freight traffic forecasts; the extent of the capacity constraints and the ability of the railroads to meet the rising demand; the infrastructure investment needed to ensure that the Nation's freight rail system continues to operate in an efficient and reliable manner; possible solutions to the challenges presented by growing rail traffic and limited capacity; and the potential role of public-private partnerships and innovative financing tools in meeting these challenges. We look forward to hearing from all parties affected by these issues, including carriers, shippers, port administrators, state entities and federal agencies.

Date of Hearing. The hearing will begin at 9 a.m. on Wednesday, April 11, 2007, in the 1st floor hearing room at the Board's new headquarters at 395 E Street, SW., in Washington, DC, and will continue, with short breaks if necessary, until every person scheduled to speak has been heard.

Notice of Intent To Participate. Any person wishing to speak at the hearing should file with the Board a written notice of intent to participate, and should identify the party, the proposed speaker, the time requested, and topic(s)

[1] Congressional Budget Office Report, *Freight Rail Transportation: Long-Term Issues,* at 4–5 (January 2006).

[2] *Id.* at 6, *citing,* Federal Highway Administration, *Freight Analysis Framework* (October 2002).