

obtained. Copies of the Draft EIS are also available for public inspection and review. See Supplementary Information section for locations.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request copies of the Draft EIS or for additional information, contact: Mr. Vincent P. Barone, FHWA Colorado Division, 555 Zang Street, Room 250, Denver, CO 80228, Telephone (303) 969-6730, extension 369; or Mr. David L. Beckhouse, FTA Region VIII, 216 16th Street Mall, Suite 650, Denver, CO 80202, Telephone (303) 844-3242

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Hearing Dates and Locations:

- Thursday, September 9, 1999, Most Precious Blood Catholic School, 2250 South Harrison Street, Denver, CO 80237, 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
- Thursday, September 16, 1999, Calvary Baptist Church, 6500 East Girard Avenue, Denver, CO 80224, 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Copies of the Draft EIS, supporting technical reports and engineering plan sheets are available in hard copy format for public inspection at:

- CDOT Region 6 Office, 2000 South Holly Street, Denver, CO 80222, 303-757-9372
- CDOT Environmental Services, 1325 S. Colorado Boulevard, Denver, CO 80222, 303-757-9259
- RTD Administrative Services, 1600 Blake Street, Denver, CO 80202, 303-299-2484
- Denver Public Library, 10 West 14th Avenue, Denver, CO 80203, 303-640-6220
- Castlewood Public Library, 6739 South Uinta Street, Denver, CO 80237, 303-771-3197
- Southeast Corridor Project Office (Carter & Burgess), 216 16th Street Mall, Suite 1700, Denver CO 80202, 303-820-5278

The Draft EIS evaluated a No-Action, and a Preliminary Preferred Alternative (including transportation management solutions) in the I-25 Southeast Corridor study limits from Broadway to Lincoln Avenue, which includes I-225 from I-25 to Parker Road, and determined the estimated costs and potential impacts associated with each. CDOT was the local lead agency for the preparation of the Draft EIS. The Draft EIS satisfies the requirements of the 1999 Clean Air Act Amendments.

The FHWA, the FTA, the CDOT, the RTD and other local agencies invite interested individuals, organizations, and Federal, State and local agencies to comment on the identified preferred alternative and associated social, economic, or environmental impacts related to the alternatives.

The preferred alternative is consistent with the Southeast Corridor Major Investment Study completed in July, 1997. It begins at approximately I-25 and Broadway and proceeds south and southeast to Lincoln Avenue following the general alignment of I-25. Also included is a segment along I-225 from I-25 to Parker Road. The preferred alternative excludes any proposed roadway improvements near I-25 from 6th Avenue to approximately the Logan Street crossing including the I-25 interchanges at Alameda, Santa Fe, and Broadway. The primary purpose of the Southeast Corridor Multi-Modal Project is to improve travel time and enhance safety along these two transportation corridors, while causing the least disruption to neighboring residents and businesses. The Southeast Corridor is the most heavily congested corridor on a daily basis, in the State of Colorado. It has been the focus of study for twenty years. These studies have consistently recommended that improvements be made to the highway system and to the provision of public transit.

The alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS include the following:

1. The No-Action alternative served as the baseline for environmental analysis and consists of the existing transit and highway systems and all projects contained in the federally approved Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Denver metropolitan area.
2. The Preliminary Preferred Alternative generally used the I-25 right-of-way between Broadway and Lincoln Avenue, and the I-225 right-of-way between I-25 and Parker. There are 17.9 miles of double tracked light rail transit beginning at the existing Broadway Station and ending at Lincoln Avenue on the west side of I-25. Light rail will also be added to the median of I-225, from I-25 to the existing Nine Mile Park-n-Ride. There will be thirteen stations. Improvements to I-25 and I-225 consist of one additional lane in each direction on I-25 from Logan Avenue to I-225, two additional lanes in each direction on I-25 from I-225 to C-470/E-470 and one additional lane in each direction on I-225 from I-25 to Yosemite. This alternative is designed to accommodate future transportation needs and includes improvements to the highway, transportation systems management, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the study area.

The FHWA, the FTA, the CDOT and the RTD evaluated all significant social, economic, and environmental impacts of the alternatives. The primary areas of examination included transit ridership, the capital outlays needed to construct the recommended alternative, the cost

of operating and maintaining facilities created by the project, and the financial requirements on the funding agencies. Environmental and social impacts evaluated in the analysis include land use and neighborhood impacts, traffic and parking impacts near stations, visual impacts, hazardous material impacts, impacts on cultural and paleontological resources, and noise and vibration impacts. Impacts on natural areas, threatened and endangered species, air and water quality, and groundwater are also covered. Right-of-way impacts are also identified. Impacts were also evaluated both for the construction period and for the long-term period of operation. Measures to mitigate adverse impacts were developed.

In accordance with the Federal Transit Act, as amended, and FHWA and FTA policy, the Draft EIS was prepared with required engineering design studies necessary to complete the document. On the basis of the Draft EIS and the comments received, a preferred alternative will be selected and preparation of the Final EIS and Record of Decision will proceed.

(23 U.S.C. 315; 49 U.S.C. 107, 5301 *et seq.*; 49 CFR 1.48 and 1.51)

Issued on August 12, 1999.

James Daves,

Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, Lakewood, Colorado.

Louis F. Mraz, Jr.,

Regional Administrator, Federal Transit Administration, Region VIII, Denver, Colorado.

[FR Doc. 99-21395 Filed 8-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA 99-5541; Notice 2]

Vectrix Corporation; Grant of Application for Temporary Exemption From Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 123

For the reasons expressed below, we are granting the petition by Vectrix Corporation of New Bedford, Massachusetts, 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 grant is our finding that "the exemption would make the development or field evaluation of a low-emission vehicle easier and would not unreasonably

lower the safety level of that vehicle," 49 U.S.C. Sec. 30113(b)(3)(B)(iii).

We published notice of receipt of the application on April 26, 1999, affording an opportunity for comment (64 FR 20353). No comments were received on this notice.

The following discussion is based on information in Vectrix's application.

Argument Why an Exemption Would Make the Development or Field Evaluation of a Low-Emission Vehicle Easier and Would Not Unreasonably Lower the Safety Level of That Vehicle

The Vectrix Electric Scooter is "powered exclusively by an electric motor which draws current from ten 12-volt lead-acid batteries wired in series," and is a "low-emission vehicle" within the meaning of the statute.

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). Vectrix would like to use the left handlebar as the control for the rear brakes of its Electric Scooter whose "peak motor output of 26 horsepower" produces more than the 5 hp maximum that separates motor driven cycles from motorcycles. The Electric Scooter can attain speeds up to 60 mph. The gear ratio of the vehicle is fixed, and "there is no need for the rider to shift gears, as on a standard motorcycle." Because of this, the Electric Scooter "is equipped with neither a clutch nor a clutch lever, and the left hand of the rider is free to operate a brake lever." Vectrix states that it prefers this design, given its focus on European and Asian markets "where rear brake controls for scooters of all horsepower ratings are typically mounted on the left handlebar."

Vectrix argues that a left handlebar rear-brake control "will not 'unreasonably degrade the safety of the vehicle,' compared to a fully compliant vehicle equipped with a right foot, rear brake pedal." It believes that "vehicle safety might be somewhat enhanced with the left hand brake lever, as the hand (bare or gloved) is generally more capable of sensitive modulation of the braking force than the foot." It also argues that the prevalence of this design in other countries attests to the fact that this type of vehicle "can be operated safely."

Vectrix intends to field test "a small fleet" of Electric Scooters, to assess "any weaknesses in the design before production begins in summer, 1999." Requiring it to redesign the Electric Scooter to incorporate a rear brake foot pedal would delay the road test program

by six months. While an exemption is in effect, Vectrix would consider whether the U.S. scooter market offered sufficient sales potential to justify creation of a U.S.-specific design incorporating a right foot brake pedal. Alternatively, it might petition NHTSA for rulemaking to "allow the rear brake to be operated by a lever mounted on the left handlebar for all motorcycles designed without a clutch."

The applicant anticipates sales of 600 Electric Scooters while an exemption is in effect.

Arguments Why an Exemption Would Be in the Public Interest and Consistent With the Objectives of Motor Vehicle Safety

Vectrix believes that an exemption would be in the public interest and consistent with the objectives of traffic safety "because it would maintain an acceptable level of safety while accelerating the advancement of an important new class of vehicles for use by consumers and businesses."

Our Finding That an Exemption Would Make the Development or Field Evaluation of a Low-Emission Vehicle Easier and Would Not Unreasonably Lower the Safety Level of That Vehicle

In adopting Standard No. 123 in April 1972, effective September 1, 1974, we justified standardization of the location and operation of motorcycle controls as a means of minimizing operator error in responding to the motoring environment, saying that "a cyclist, especially the novice and the cyclist who has changed from one make of machine to another, must not hesitate when confronted with an emergency" (37 FR 7207). Therefore, we have traditionally regarded with concern any deviation from standardization.

Recently, we granted a petition similar to that of Vectrix, a request by Aprilia, S.p.A., for a temporary exemption of its Leonardo 150 that would allow the left hand control to serve as the control for the rear brake (64 FR 44264). We had asked Aprilia to comment on our concern that a left hand lever-operated rear brake may contribute to unfamiliarity and thus degrade a rider's overall braking reaction beyond what would exist on a motorcycle with conventionally configured controls. At the request of Aprilia's U.S. sales subsidiary, Aprilia U.S.A. Inc. of Woodstock, Georgia, Carter Engineering of Franklin, Tennessee, prepared a report on "Motorscooter Braking Control Study" (Report No. CE-99-APR-05, May 1999) comparing braking response times of riders using the left hand control of the

Leonardo 150 and the right foot control of the Yamaha XC-125 Riva. We placed a copy of this report in Docket No. NHTSA-98-4357. Aprilia U.S.A. observed that "[o]verall, the test subjects' reaction times on the Leonardo were approximately 20% quicker than their reaction times on the conventional motorcycle." Aprilia believed that "a less complex braking arrangement like that of the Leonardo will improve rider reaction in an emergency situation."

We interpreted the report as indicating that a Leonardo rider's braking response is not likely to be degraded by the different placement of the brake controls, thus directly addressing and meeting our safety concern. We believe it is also germane to consider that it applies to Vectrix's Electric Scooter as well. The maximum speed of the Vectrix, 60 mph, is slightly less than that of the Leonardo 150's 65.7 mph. The principal difference between the two vehicles appears to be in the method of propulsion, which we do not deem relevant to the issue of rear brake control location and operation. An exemption would permit Vectrix to test market the 600 vehicles intended.

Accordingly, we find that a temporary exemption would make the development and field evaluation of a low-emission motor vehicle easier, and that such an exemption would not unreasonably lower the safety level of the vehicle.

Our Finding That an Exemption Would Be in the Public Interest and Consistent With the Objectives of Motor Vehicle Safety

We find that the entry into the nation's motor vehicle fleet of 600 low-emission motor vehicles is in the public interest. We also find that allowing this limited number of motor vehicles whose rear brake controls allows braking performance at least equivalent to that of a conforming vehicle is consistent with the objectives of motor vehicle safety.

Therefore, Vectrix Corporation is hereby granted NHTSA Temporary Exemption No. 99-10 from the requirement of Item 11, Column 2, Table 1 of 49 CFR 571.123 Standard No. 123, *Motorcycle Controls and Displays*, that the rear wheel brakes be operable through the right foot control. This exemption applies only to the Electric Scooter and will expire on July 1, 2001. (49 U.S.C. 30113; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.)

Issued on: August 12, 1999.

Ricardo Martinez,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 99-21338 Filed 8-16-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Ex Parte No. 633]

Y2K Readiness

AGENCY: Surface Transportation Board.

ACTION: Y2K Notice.

SUMMARY: The Surface Transportation Board (Board) is opening this docket for railroads and other interested parties to inform the Board of any anticipated Y2K problems within the railroad transportation industries.

DATES: Comments should be filed as soon as possible after any Y2K problems are discovered that will not be corrected by December 31, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Send an original plus 10 copies of any comments, referring to STB Ex Parte No. 633, to the Surface Transportation Board, Office of the Secretary, Case Control Unit, 1925 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20423-0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Melvin F. Clemens, Jr., (202) 565-1573. [TDD for the hearing impaired: (202) 565-1695.]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under 49 U.S.C. 11101(a), railroads must provide transportation or rail services upon reasonable request. Given the complex nature of railroad operations, switching and interchange, some potential Y2K problems appear capable of disrupting railroad operations and the smooth flow of traffic between rail carriers. In such an event, the Board is prepared to assume an active role in the interest of the public, both to maintain rail operations while any computer problems are repaired and to take steps to return rail service to normal levels. If rail service is disrupted, the Board can issue temporary emergency service orders and can direct a carrier to operate the lines of another carrier that has ceased operations. Such orders can be effective for a period of up to 270 days. Emergency orders may direct the handling, routing, or distribution of traffic; require joint or common use of railroad facilities; or prescribe temporary through routes. Additionally, the Board may prioritize traffic, such as the movements of coal to electric generating plants, and require traffic to move only under special permits.

The Board also may issue emergency orders to enable Amtrak to reroute passenger trains when its normal routes are temporarily unavailable. Through the Board's Agent, Melvin F. Clemens, Jr., Director, Office of Compliance and Enforcement, such emergency orders may be issued at any time, day or night.

In order to assist the Board in preparing for any possible disruptions of railroad operations that may result from Y2K problems, the Board is requesting railroads and other interested parties to inform the Board of any such anticipated problems before they occur. Such information to the Board should be based on specific Y2K problems that are considered unresolvable by December 31, 1999.

Additionally, under section 18 of the Y2K Act, Pub. L. 106-37, 113 Stat. 185, civil penalties are suspended for a small business concern, as defined in section 105 of Title 5, United States Code, for a first time violation of a Federally enforceable rule or regulation caused by a Y2K failure, if that Federal rule or regulation has not been violated within the preceding 3 years by that small business concern. Under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 119, the Board has the authority to impose civil penalties for violations of statutes and regulations within its jurisdiction. Under section 18 of the Y2K Act, each agency of the United States Government with such authority must establish a point of contact within the agency to act as a liaison between the agency and small business concerns with respect to problems arising out of Y2K failures and compliance with Federal rules or regulations. The Board is complying with this statutory requirement by designating its Office of Compliance and Enforcement as its point of contact for small business concerns that experience a Y2K failure.

Board decisions and notices are available on our website at "WWW.STB.DOT.GOV." This notice will also be specifically served on the Association of American Railroads, The American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association, the Federal Railroad Administration, and Amtrak.

Decided: August 17, 1999.

By the Board, Chairman Morgan, Vice Chairman Clyburn, and Commissioner Burkes.

Vernon A. Williams,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99-21820 Filed 8-18-99; 2:52 pm]

BILLING CODE 4915-00-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of the Comptroller of the Currency

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC), Treasury.

ACTION: Submission for OMB review; comment request.

SUMMARY: The OCC, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on a continuing information collection, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The OCC may not conduct or sponsor, and a respondent is not required to respond to, an information collection that has been extended, revised, or implemented unless it displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. Currently, the OCC is soliciting comments concerning extension, without change, of an information collection titled Fiduciary Activities of National Banks (12 CFR 9). The OCC also gives notice that it has sent the information collection to OMB for review.

DATES: You should submit your written comments to both OCC and the OMB Reviewer by September 20, 1999.

ADDRESSES: You should send your written comments to the Communications Division, Attention: 1557-0140, Third Floor, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, 250 E Street, SW, Washington, DC 20219. In addition, you can send comments by facsimile transmission to (202) 874-5274, or by electronic mail to regs.comments@occ.treas.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: You may request additional information, a copy of the collection, or a copy of the supporting documentation submitted to OMB by contacting Jessie Gates or Camille Dixon, (202) 874-5090, Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division (1557-0140), Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, 250 E Street, SW, Washington, DC 20219.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The OCC is proposing to extend OMB approval of the following information collection:

Title: Fiduciary Activities of National Banks (12 CFR 9).

OMB Number: 1557-0140.

Form Number: None.

Abstract: This submission covers an existing regulation and involves no change to the regulation or to the