

runs in an east-west direction. The Facility is a of masonry construction with face brick. The roof system is a truss type, with a newer roof covering. There is a covered front canopy entry, which has a glass entry and large windows on the front of the building. The building contains approximately 16,453 square feet of gross area. This area is divided into an area containing 11,992 square feet with an eave height of 20 feet, an office area containing 2,490 square feet or 15.13% of the gross building area and a mezzanine storage area containing 1,971 feet. The building has concrete block walls. The interior finish includes a fair to average quality, 2' x 2' suspended acoustic ceiling, with carpeted floors and concrete block interior walls. There are two restrooms, a locker room and a break room. There is strip fluorescent lighting. There is an adequate electrical service, which appears to be at least 200 amps. There is gas-fired, strip radiant heat in the warehouse area. The eastern portion of the building also has a heated floor. The office area has a gas forced air system with air conditioning. A 40-gallon, gas-fired heater provides hot water. There is adequate onsite, blacktopped driveways and parking areas. There are concrete curbs and there is minimal but adequate landscaping.

Issued on: October 25, 2001.

Donald Gismondi,

Deputy Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 01-27403 Filed 10-31-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-57-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Reports, Forms and Record Keeping Requirements; Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The ICR describes the nature of the information collections and their expected burden. The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period was published on June 13, 2001 (66 FR 31974).

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before December 3, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Walter Culbreath, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Office of Administration (NAD-40), 202-366-1566. 400 Seventh Street, SW, Room 6240, Washington, DC 20590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Title: 49 CFR Part 580 Odometer Disclosure Statement.

OMB Number: 2127-0047.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Abstract: The Federal Odometer Law, 49 U.S.C. chapter 327, and implementing regulations, 49 CFR part 580 require each transferor of a motor vehicle to provide the transferee with a written disclosure of the vehicle's mileage. This disclosure is to be made on the vehicle's title, or in the case of a vehicle that has never been titled, on a separate form. If the title is lost or is held by a lien holder, and where permitted by state law, the disclosure can be made on a stat-issued, secure power of attorney.

Affected Public: Households, Business, other for-profit, and not-for-profit institutions, Federal Government, and State, Local, or Tribal Government.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 2,586,160.

ADDRESSES: Send comments, within 30 days, to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725-17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503, Attention NHTSA Desk Officer.

Comments are invited on: Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility; the accuracy of the Departments estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

A Comment to OMB is most effective if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication.

Issued in Washington, DC, on October 29, 2001.

Herman L. Simms,

Associate Administrator for Administration.

[FR Doc. 01-27473 Filed 10-31-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Reports, Forms and Record Keeping Requirements; Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The ICR describes the nature of the information collections and their expected burden. The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period was published on July 24, 2001 [66 FR 38449-38450].

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before December 3, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Walter Culbreath at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, (NAD-40), 202-366-1566. 400 Seventh Street, SW., Room 6132, Washington, DC 20590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Title: Uniform Safety Program Cost Summary Form for Highway Safety Plan.

OMB Number: 2127-0003.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Abstract: The Highway Safety Plan identifies State's traffic safety problems and describes the program and projects to address those problems. In order to account for funds expended under the priority areas and other program areas, States are required to submit a Program Cost Summary. The program cost summary is completed to reflect the state's proposed allocations of funds (including carry-forward funds) by program area, based on the projects and activities identified in the Highway Safety Plan.

Affected Public: State, Local or Tribal Government.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 570.

Addresses: Send comments, within 30 days, to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725-17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention NHTSA Desk Officer.

Comments are invited on: Whether the proposed collection of information

is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility; the accuracy of the Department's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

A Comment to OMB is most effective if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication.

Issued in Washington, DC, on October 29, 2001.

Herman L. Simms,

Associate Administrator for Administration.

[FR Doc. 01-27474 Filed 10-31-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Denial of a Petition for a Defect Investigation, DP01-001

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

ACTION: Denial of petition for a defect investigation.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the reasons for the denial of a petition submitted to NHTSA under 49 U.S.C. 30162, requesting that the agency investigate an alleged safety-related defect in certain Ford Escort and Mercury Tracer vehicles. The petition is hereinafter identified as DP01-001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter C. Ong, Office of Defects Investigation, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20590. Telephone: (202) 366-0583.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Mr. Randy D. Brantley (petitioner) submitted a petition to NHTSA by letter dated February 13, 2001, requesting that a safety-related defect investigation be initiated with respect to the non-deployment of the frontal air bags in frontal crashes in model years (MY) 1998 through 1999 Ford Escort and Mercury Tracer passenger vehicles. Specifically, the petitioner alleges that he had noticed in NHTSA's consumer complaint database that there were many reports of both driver and passenger side air bags not deploying upon impact. Since both the MY 1998 and 1999 Ford Escort and Mercury Tracer have the same frontal passive

restraint system, they are treated as the subject vehicles in this analysis.

The frontal air bag supplemental restraint system, when used with safety belts, is part of the vehicle's frontal occupant protection system that includes the vehicle's structural crumple zone, interior structure design/padding, instrument panel (IP) padding, and the energy absorbing steering wheel. As a supplemental restraint system, the air bag restraints reduce the risk of severe injuries and fatalities in frontal impacts. The air bags are designed to deploy and inflate in impacts that generate sufficient longitudinal deceleration to potentially cause moderate to serious injury to the vehicle's front seat occupants. Frontal air bags are not designed to deploy in side, rear, or rollover crashes or in frontal impacts that generate low longitudinal deceleration (such as low speed impacts and "soft" impacts that result in sheet metal deformation as opposed to major chassis/structural damage).

Manufacturers set deployment thresholds to enhance protection of the frontal occupants in severe frontal collisions such that the deployment of the air bags would help reduce the risk of serious injury or fatality. Likewise, the threshold is designed to prevent deployment in less severe collisions where air bag deployment is not likely to provide substantial benefits. The risk of injury during air bag deployment, particularly with respect to unbelted or out-of-position occupants, also provides a sound basis for setting the threshold to prevent deployment in less severe collisions. Manufacturers may select the deployment threshold that they believe is the most appropriate.

Real-world collisions often involve offset impacts, oblique angle impacts, override or underide impacts. These different impacts may or may not generate sufficient force and deceleration along the front to rear axis of the vehicle or apply significant force to the frame, suspension and engine to initiate air bag inflation. This can lead consumers to expect that the air bag should deploy in certain crashes resulting in significant body damage to the vehicle when in fact the crash force along the front to rear axis of the vehicle was not sufficient to deploy the air bags. The misconceptions about the criteria for deployment have caused allegations of non-deployment to be the most common type of air bag-related complaint reported to NHTSA.

When reviewing allegations of improper air bag non-deployment, NHTSA investigators analyze (1) The extent of vehicle frontal damage through

pictures, repair invoices, and/or police accident reports, (2) the medical records to ascertain type and severity of personal injury, and (3) technical information that may indicate systematic or component related defect trends that lead to the non-deployment of the air bags.

A review of the agency's data files, including information reported to the DOT Auto Safety Hotline, shows 72 complaints of non-deployment in the subject vehicles. Thirty-nine of these complaints alleged injuries due to the non-deployment. (In the manufacturer's database, only 44 of the 278 owner reports/crash claims/litigation cases alleged injury associated with air bag non-deployments.) NHTSA attempted to contact all of the 39 complainants who alleged injury, plus some of the more recent complainants who did not specify any injury, to request additional crash and/or injury information. The follow-up contacts provided additional crash and injury information from 34 complainants.

NHTSA reviewed its crash reports and Ford's information, including crash damage, vehicle crash dynamics, and injury severity, and did not find any trend or pattern of air bags in the subject vehicles failing to deploy in crashes when they should have deployed. The crashes were minor in nature and many of them were underide impacts into the rear of pickup trucks, which typically result in major deformation of the vehicle's hood and upper regions of the fenders that absorbs much of the crash energy. It should be noted that a complaint often alleges an impact speed higher than what the damage indicates, since pre-impact braking will often slow the vehicle down dramatically prior to impact, and a driver will often not have any reliable way to estimate the actual impact speed.

Furthermore, NHTSA's analysis of the injuries experienced by the occupants of the subject vehicles does not suggest that deployment of the air bags in the subject vehicles in these crashes would have provided significant benefit. The injuries were minor in nature. All but one were AIS-1 (Abbreviated Injury Scale) severity injuries, with one AIS-2 severity injury (broken nose).

NHTSA reviewed Ford's developmental tests on air bag deployments and found that the frontal air bags in the subject vehicles deploy at an impact velocity comparable to other passenger vehicles. Ford reports that the air bag system in the subject vehicles are designed not to deploy when a vehicle is operated on rough roads and not to deploy under "soft" impacts that damage sheet metal but do