

RTP, additional right-of-way will have to be acquired.

- Regional vehicle travel, especially residential trips to and from work in the Resort Corridor, contribute significantly to the travel demands placed on the Resort Corridor's roadways.

- Regional utilization of public bus transit (Citizens Area Transit or CAT) increased 175 percent between 1993 and 1997. Attempting to solve the roadway congestion conditions in the Resort Corridor solely by expanding the ridership on CAT will be virtually impossible unless substantial infrastructure improvements are also implemented to increase the ability of buses to operate on the roadways.

- Meeting the mobility demands within the Resort Corridor will require the establishment of a multi-modal, fully integrated set of transportation solutions.

- Travel volumes, land use densities, and employment concentration will warrant the consideration of establishing a higher order of public transit that operates in a separate right-of-way.

- Programs directed at reducing the amount of travel in private vehicles and encouraging the use of public transit within the Resort Corridor and between the Resort Corridor and the remainder of the community are needed.

The MIS process developed a number of alternatives to address the above statement of needs. Detailed analysis at a conceptual engineering level was completed for a set of multi-modal alternatives to identify cost, ridership, cost-effectiveness measures, and environmental benefits and impacts. The results led to the development and adoption of a Transportation Master Plan for the Resort Corridor that includes four components: a fixed guideway element, an enhanced bus program, a transportation demand management element, and a street and highway element along with the adoption of a Phase 1 fixed guideway element and supporting bus system component. This EIS focuses on the fixed guideway element and the supporting bus system component.

III. Alternatives

The EIS will evaluate the following alternatives adopted as part of the fixed guideway element of the Transportation Master Plan for the Resort Corridor as defined in the Resort Corridor Major Investment Study (MIS), Final Evaluation Report, dated October 9, 1997: (1) The Fixed Guideway Element Initial Operating Segment (IOS). This alternative includes an elevated fixed guideway system 5.2 miles long, 10

fixed guideway stations, a supporting bus transit system element, and is also known as Phase 1 of the Resort Corridor Transportation Master Plan. (2) The Fixed Guideway Element Core System. This alternative includes an elevated fixed guideway System 15.6 miles long, 27 fixed guideway stations, and a supporting bus transit system element. (3) The Fixed Guideway Element Core system with an extension along Harmon Avenue to McCarran International Airport. This alternative includes an elevated fixed guideway system 18.4 miles long, 31 fixed guideway stations, and a supporting bus transit system element. (4) The Fixed Guideway Core System with an extension along Tropicana Avenue to McCarran International Airport. This alternative includes an elevated fixed guideway system 18.0 miles long, 28 fixed guideway stations, and a supporting bus transit system element. (5) A No Build alternative, which involves no change to transportation services or facilities in the Resort Corridor beyond already committed projects. In addition, special consideration will be given to evaluating three alternative technology groups for the elevated fixed guideway system. These technologies include light rail transit (LRT), automated guideway transit (AGT), and large monorail transit systems. Potential new feasible alternatives or revisions to the above alternatives generated through the scoping process will also be considered.

IV. Probable Effects

FTA and RTC will evaluate, in the EIS, all significant social, economic, and environmental impacts of the alternatives. The previous MIS study evaluated these impacts at level of detail sufficient to adopt the components of the Transportation Master Plan and to identify the alternatives and issues to be addressed in the EIS. Among the primary transit issues to be evaluated in the EIS are the expected increase in transit ridership including visitor trips and residents trips, the expected increase in mobility for the transit dependent population, the support of the region's air quality goals, the economic benefits, satisfying the overall transportation needs of the Resort Corridor, the capital outlays needed to construct the project, the cost of operating and maintaining the facilities created by the project, the impacts of any private urban transit-grade fixed guideway projects, and the financial impacts on the funding agencies. Potentially affected environmental and social resources proposed for further analyses and re-evaluation in the EIS include, land use and neighborhood

impacts, residential and business displacements and relocations, traffic and parking impacts near stations and along the alignments, visual impacts, noise and vibration impacts, major utility relocation impacts, and impacts on cultural and archaeological resources. Impacts on air quality, water quality, and hazardous waste sites will also be covered. The impacts will be evaluated both for the construction period and for the long-term period of operation. Measures to mitigate significant adverse impacts will be considered.

V. FTA Procedures

The EIS alternatives with conceptual engineering detail and the Preliminary Engineering level of detail for the Phase 1, Initial Operating Segment (IOS) alternative will be prepared simultaneously. The EIS/conceptual engineering process will assess the social, economic, and environmental impacts of the proposed alternatives while refining their design to minimize and mitigate any adverse impacts. After its publication, the Draft EIS will be available for public review and comment, and public hearings will be held. On the basis of the Draft EIS and comments received, RTC will select a refined Fixed Guideway Element and a refined fixed guideway IOS project definition. RTC will then select the refined IOS project alternative that will be carried into the Final EIS and will complete the preliminary engineering. Following this action by RTC, RTC will request FTA authorization to proceed with the Final EIS and to complete the preliminary engineering activities.

Issued on: September 2, 1998.

Leslie T. Rogers,

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 98-24025 Filed 9-3-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-57-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket No. MARAD-98-4403]

Information Collection Available for Public Comments and Recommendations

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the Maritime Administration's (MARAD's) intentions to request approval for three years of a new information collection entitled Customer Service Surveys.

DATES: Comments should be submitted on or before November 3, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

James J. Zok, Associate Administrator for Ship Financial Assistance and Cargo Preference, MAR-500, Room 8126, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20590. Telephone 202-366-0364 or fax 202-366-7901. Copies of this collection can also be obtained from that office.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title of Collection: Customer Service Survey.

Type of Request: Approval of a new information collection.

OMB Control Number: 2133-

Form Number: MA-1016; MA-1017.

Expiration Date of Approval: Three years from the date of approval.

Summary of Collection of Information: Executive Order 12862 requires agencies to survey customers to determine the kind and quality of services they want and the level of their satisfaction with existing services. This collection covers MARAD forms used to carry out such surveys covering MARAD programs and services.

Need and Use of the Information: (1) Responses to the Customer Service Questionnaire are needed to obtain prompt customer feedback on the quality of specific services/products provided to the customer by MARAD. The information provided will be used to ascertain the customer's level of satisfaction. (2) Responses to the Program Performance Survey are needed to obtain customers' views on MARAD's major programs and activities with which the customers were involved during the preceding year. The information provided will be used by MARAD's senior management and MARAD's program managers to monitor the overall level of customer satisfaction and to identify areas for improvement in program service or product delivery.

Description of Respondents: Individuals/Entities directly served by MARAD.

Annual Responses: 8250 responses.

Annual Burden: 300 hours.

Comments: Signed written comments should refer to the docket number that appears at the top of this document and must be submitted to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20590. Specifically, address whether this information collection is necessary for proper performance of the function of the agency and will have practical utility, accuracy of the burden estimates, ways to minimize this burden, and ways to enhance quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected. All comments received

will be available for examination at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., e.t. Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays. An electronic version of this document is available on the World Wide Web at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

Dated: September 1, 1998.

By Order of the Maritime Administrator.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-23909 Filed 9-3-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-81-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Denial of Motor Vehicle Defect Petition, DP98-005

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 commence a proceeding to determine the existence of a defect related to motor vehicle safety. The petition is hereinafter identified as DP98-005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. George Chiang, Office of Defects Investigation (ODI), NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: (202) 366-5206.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Mr. Jeff Glick of Seattle, Washington, submitted a petition dated May 14, 1998, requesting that an investigation be initiated to determine whether Model Year (MY) 1994 Ford Probe vehicles contain a defect related to motor vehicle safety within the meaning of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301. The petition alleges that MY 1994 Ford Probes have a defective oil pump that can fail, and that such a failure can pose a safety hazard. In addition, the petitioner alleges that the oil pump contains a safety-related defect as described in Technical Service Bulletin (TSB) No. 96-21-3 issued by Ford Motor Company (Ford).

TSB No. 96-21-3 concerns the oil pump in MY 1993 through 1996 Ford Probe vehicles with a 2.0 liter engine (the subject vehicles). An uneven wear pattern on the oil pump control plunger can cause the plunger to stick and fail to properly regulate the oil pressure in the engine. If the oil pressure is too low, it may cause the hydraulic lash adjuster to bleed down. This will produce a

metallic "ticking" noise at idle. If the oil pressure is too high, the hydraulic lash adjusters may pump up, causing the cylinder head valves to stay open. This may be accompanied by rough running, missing, reduced power, and at times stalling. Ford modified the oil pump with an improved oil pump plunger to reduce the possibility of sticking. The new oil pump is used in MY 1997 and later MY Probes and as well as the replacement part for the subject vehicles. The new oil pump has part number F72Z-6600-AA.

A review of agency data files, including information reported to the Auto Safety Hotline by consumers, indicated that aside from the petition, there was a complaint report submitted by the petitioner in February of this year concerning loss of power and stalling, possibly due to failure or malfunction of the oil pump. The agency has received no other complaints regarding oil pump problems in the subject vehicles.

Ford provided information to ODI on July 30, 1998, stating that it has received 1,552 complaint reports concerning "ticking/clicking" or other engine noise concerns in the subject vehicles. (A total of 192,563 subject vehicles were produced in MY 1993-1996.) Ford reported only 48 alleged vehicle "stalling" or engine "dies" complaints that may be associated with the defective oil pump, and none report injuries or crashes.

The petitioner alleged that failure of the oil pump can cause a safety hazard because it can cause loss of engine power and stalling.

Based on the TSB, the problem may be noticed as an engine "ticking" noise. The petitioner affirms this symptom as well as the oil pressure gauge showing a high pressure reading. The noise and or high oil pressure gauge reading may alert the owner to bring the vehicle in for repair. The high ratio of reported engine noise "ticking/clicking" complaints (1,552) compared to those of "stalling" or "dies" (48) suggests that the problem often produces significant symptoms noticed by drivers, but only rarely leads to stalling.

The agency has analyzed the available information concerning the problem alleged in the petition, including the information obtained from the evaluation of the ODI and Ford complaints and an analysis of potential failure mode. While stalling may have a significant adverse effect on safety, particularly where the incidence rate is high or there is no warning, here the malfunctioning of the Ford oil pump plunger has not been shown to result in a substantial rate of stalling incidents