1990) (Pub. L. 101–508) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

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

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Federal Aviation Administration, Central Region, Airports Division, 901 Locust, Kansas City, MO 64106.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Ms. Kim Bakker, Assistant Director of Aviation, Waterloo Municipal Airport, at the following address: 2790 Livingston lane, Waterloo, Iowa 50703.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the Waterloo Municipal Airport, under section 158.23 of Part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lorna Sandridge, PFC Program Manager, FAA, Central Region, 901 Locust, Kansas City, MO 64106, (816) 329–2641. The application may be reviewed in person at this same location.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC at the Waterloo Municipal Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Pub. L. 101–508) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 158).

On August 29, 2001, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by the Waterloo Municipal Airport was substantially complete within the requirements of section 158.25 of Part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than November 28, 2001.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

Level of the proposed PFC: $4.50.

Proposed charge effective date: February, 2002.

Proposed charge expiration date: July, 2004.

Total estimated use revenue: $801,800.

Total estimated impose revenue: $291,800.

Brief description of proposed project(s): Terminal Building Modernization—Construction; Runway 12/30 Rejuvenation; Runway 18/36 Rejuvenation; Reconstruct Taxiway E; Reconstruct Taxiway A.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Waterloo Municipal Airport.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri on August 29, 2001.

George A. Hendon,

Manager, Airports Division, Central Region.

[FR Doc. 01–23695 Filed 9–20–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

[Docket Number FRA–2001–9270]

Wabtec Railway Electronics; Public Hearing

On April 6, 2001, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) published a notice in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 18351) announcing Wabtec Railway Electronic's (Wabtec) request to obtain a permanent waiver of compliance from certain provisions of the Power Brakes and Drawbars regulations, 49 CFR part 232, regarding two-way end-of-train devices. Specifically, § 232.23(f)(2), which requires: ''The rear unit batteries shall be sufficiently charged at the initial terminal or other point where the device is installed and throughout the train's trip to ensure that the end-of-train-device will remain operative until the train reaches its destination.'' Due to an administrative error on the part of the agency, an incomplete copy of Wabtec's petition was filed in the public docket. That error was corrected and FRA extended the comment period by thirty days with a notice in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 31274).

As a result of the comments received by FRA concerning this waiver petition, FRA has determined that a public hearing is necessary before a final decision is made on this petition. Accordingly, a public hearing is hearby set for 10 a.m. on October 18, 2001, in Conference Room #1 on the seventh floor, at the FRA Headquarters Building, 1120 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20005. Interested parties are invited to present oral statements at this hearing. The hearing will be informal and will be conducted in accordance with Rule 25 of the FRA Rules of Practice (49 CFR 211.25) by a representative designated by the FRA. The FRA representative will make an opening statement outlining the scope of the hearing, as well as any additional procedures for the conduct of the hearing. The hearing will be a non-adversarial proceeding in which all interested parties will be given the opportunity to express their views regarding this waiver petition, without cross-examination. After all initial statements have been completed, those persons wishing to make a brief rebuttal will be given an opportunity to do so in the same order in which initial statements were made.

Issued in Washington, DC, on September 12, 2001.

Grady C. Cothen, Jr.,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Standards and Program Development.

[FR Doc. 01–23547 Filed 9–20–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

Notice of Application for Approval of Discontinuance or Modification of a Railroad Signal System or Relief From Requirements

Pursuant to Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part 235 and 49 U.S.C. 20502(a), the following railroads have petitioned the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) seeking approval for the discontinuance or modification of the signal system or relief from the requirements of 49 CFR part 236 as detailed below.

Docket Number. FRA–2001–10217

Applicants:

Norfolk Southern Corporation, Mr. Brian L. Sykes, Chief Engineer C&S Engineering, 99 Spring Street, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303.

West Tennessee Railroad, Mr. Bruce Hohorst, President, One Depot Street,Trenton, Tennessee 38382.

Norfolk Southern Corporation (NS) and the West Tennessee Railroad jointly seek approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of the automatic block signal system on the Alabama Division, Jackson District, between Fulton Junction, milepost IC–406.2, near Fulton, Kentucky and Ruslor Junction, milepost IC–526.0, near Corinth, Mississippi, a distance of approximately 120 miles. The proposed changes include the removal of all automatic block signals, conversion of the spring switches to hand operation, and retention of the interlocking signals at Milan, Tennessee, where the NS single main track crosses at grade the single main track of CSX Transportation, Incorporated.

The reason given for the proposed changes is that present and anticipated traffic density and train movements do not warrant retention of the signal system.

Any interested party desiring to protest the granting of an application shall set forth specifically the grounds upon which the protest is made, and contain a concise statement of the interest of the party in the proceeding. Additionally, one copy of the protest shall be furnished to the applicant at the address listed above.

All communications concerning this proceeding should be identified by the docket number and must be submitted to the Docket Clerk, DOT Central Docket Management Facility, Room PI–401, Washington, DC 20590–0001. Communications received within 45 days of the date of this notice will be considered by the FRA before final action is taken. Comments received after that date will be considered as far as practicable. All written communications concerning these proceedings are available for examination during regular business hours (9:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m.) at DOT Central Docket Management Facility, Room PI–401 (Plaza Level), 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590–0001. All documents in the public docket are also available for inspection and copying on the internet at the docket facility's Web site at *http://dms.dot.gov.*

FRA expects to be able to determine these matters without an oral hearing. However, if a specific request for an oral hearing is accompanied by a showing that the party is unable to adequately present his or her position by written statements, an application may be set for public hearing.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on September 12, 2001.

Grady C. Cothen, Jr.,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Standards and Program Development.

[FR Doc. 01–23546 Filed 9–20–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Denial of Motor Vehicle Defect Petition

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

ACTION: Denial of petition to open a defect investigation.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the reasons for the denial of a petition submitted by Mr. John E. Ballow, dated July 20, 2000, to NHTSA under 49 U.S.C. 30162, which requested the agency to commence a proceeding to determine the existence of a defect related to motor vehicle safety in certain General Motors (GM) vehicles equipped with flex fans (part number 336032). After reviewing the petition and other information, NHTSA has concluded that further expenditure of the agency's investigative resources on the issues raised by the petition does not appear to be warranted. The agency accordingly denies the petition.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Frank Borris, Safety Defects Engineer, Vehicle Integrity Division, Office of Defects Investigation, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone (202) 366–5202.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In a letter dated July 20, 2000, John E. Ballow, an attorney in Buffalo, New York, petitioned NHTSA to conduct an investigation of a certain GM flexible blade engine cooling fan and, if later warranted, all flexible radiator fans offered as original equipment in GM vehicles, particularly light duty trucks. The petitioner specifically identified GM Part No. 336032 and alleged that additional injuries have been caused by this component since NHTSA last considered this issue in 1996. Enclosed with the petitioner's letter were opinions and analyses from four independent experts in fan engineering, failure analysis, engine design, and human factors engineering. As an enclosure to a supplementary letter dated September 26, 2000, the petitioner provided numerous photographs depicting the severity of injuries allegedly resulting from separated flex fan blades. NHTSA's Office of Defects Investigation (ODI) conducted a Petition Analysis to determine whether to grant the petition.

The subject fan is a 7-blade, flexible blade engine cooling fan commonly referred to as a ''flex fan,'' which was used on approximately 2.6 million GM vehicles that were produced *without* air conditioning and *with* heavy duty cooling systems. The model years and models in which the fans were used are model year (MY) 1973 through 1979 Chevrolet and GMC C/K 10, 20, and 30 series light duty trucks and the MY 1975 Chevrolet and GMC ''G'' van (subject vehicles). The flex fan concept was used by many vehicle manufacturers as a way to improve fuel efficiency. Like all flex fans, the subject fan has flexible metal blades, which are attached to the fan hub or ''spider'' by rivets, and are designed to flex or ''flatten out'' as the engine speed is increased, thus reducing the load on the engine. However, the subject fans may be susceptible to fatigue failure of the blade resulting from uncontrolled flexing (bending) due to a resonant condition.

Prior to this petition, NHTSA analyzed failures of the 336032 flex fan in response to a similar petition, DP96–007. In a letter dated May 17, 1996, Mary Walsh-Dempsey, an attorney in Scranton, Pennsylvania, petitioned NHTSA to initiate a defect investigation regarding MY 1976 Chevrolet C10 trucks concerning blade separation of the same engine cooling fan (Part No. 336032). On December 3, 1996, NHTSA denied the Walsh-Dempsey petition based on evidence showing a low failure rate, along with some consideration of the subject vehicles' age and remaining useful life.

After receiving the Ballow petition, NHTSA requested certain information from GM, requested additional information from the Petitioner, searched its database for reports of fan blade separations, and reviewed the experts' reports and credentials.

The subject fan was originally produced for GM by Canadian Fram,[1] which ceased production in approximately 1993. It was at this time that GM made a one-time purchase to maintain an inventory for future service parts. New replacements of the subject fan are available only from GM dealerships, although used units may still be available from automotive salvage businesses. At the time of this writing, GM estimates its inventory to be approximately 500 units. Part sales of the subject fan from GM dealers over the last four calendar years (1997–2000) averaged 211 units per year.

NHTSA has identified four reports of alleged failure of the subject fan since December 3, 1996, when DP96–007 was denied. Each report alleges an injury. These incidents occurred between January 1998 and September 2000. Reports on two of these incidents were provided by GM with the remaining two coming from NHTSA's database and the petitioner. One of the GM reports includes color photographs indicating the owner was struck in the neck and shoulder, requiring hospitalization.

GM's response also included two reports prepared by Canadian Fram for Chevrolet Engineering following its analysis of failed subject fans. Each of the reports, dated June 1978 and February 1979 respectively, documents findings that:

[1] Canadian Fram, Ltd., was acquired by Bendix Engine Components, Ltd., which was acquired by Allied Signal, Inc., which was acquired by Siemans Automotive, Ltd.