

Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App. 2.

Agenda of Meetings

Chemical Transportation Advisory Committee

(1) Introduction of Committee members and attendees.

(2) Progress Reports from the PTP, Hazardous Substances Response Standards, and Vessel Cargo Tank Overpressurization Subcommittees.

(3) Presentation on the Millennium Class Tanker.

(4) Presentation by a Guest Speaker on "Expansive Imbibition for Practical Pollution Particulation or Separating Things from Stuff."

(5) Coast Guard update on Cargo Authority Lists for the New Coast Guard MISLE Database.

(6) Update of Coast Guard Regulatory Projects and IMO Activities.

Subcommittee on PTP. The agenda includes the following:

(1) Continuation of work on the development of a risk management guide for the chemical transportation industry.

Subcommittee on Hazardous Substances Response Standards. The agenda includes the following:

(1) Final development of recommendations to the Coast Guard concerning protocols for emergency chemical response.

Subcommittee on Vessel Cargo Tank Overpressurization. The agenda includes the following:

(1) Continuing development of recommendations for an industry standard to address the prevention of cargo tank overpressurization during inerting, padding, purging, and line clearing operations.

Procedural

All meetings are open to the public. Please note that the meetings may close early if all business is finished. At the Chairs' discretion, members of the public may make oral presentations during the meetings. If you would like to make an oral presentation at a meeting, please notify the Executive Director no later than November 16, 2001. Written material for distribution at a meeting should reach the Coast Guard no later than November 16, 2001. If you would like a copy of your material distributed to each member of the Committee or Subcommittee in advance of the meetings, please submit 25 copies to the Executive Director no later than November 20, 2001.

Information on Services for Individuals With Disabilities

For information on facilities or services for individuals with disabilities, or to request special assistance at the meetings, contact the Assistant to the Executive Director of CTAC as soon as possible.

Dated: October 4, 2001.

Howard L. Hime,

Acting Director of Standards, Marine Safety and Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 01-26564 Filed 10-19-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on the Central Link Light Rail Transit Project

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare a supplemental environmental impact statement (EIS).

SUMMARY: The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority (Sound Transit) intend to prepare a supplemental EIS in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) on the Central Link Light Rail Transit project north corridor from Convention Place to Northgate. This is a supplemental EIS to the Central Link Light Rail Transit Project Final EIS (November 1999). The supplemental EIS will evaluate a no build alternative and light rail station and route options in three segments: Capitol Hill/South Lake Union (Convention Place Station to SR-520), Ship Canal crossing/University District (SR-520 to NE 45th Street), and the Northgate segment (NE 45th to Northgate). Scoping will be accomplished through meetings and correspondence with interested persons, organizations, the general public, federal, state and local agencies and tribes.

DATES: *Comment Due Date:* Written comments on the scope of the alternatives and impacts to be considered should be sent to Sound Transit by November 9, 2001. See **ADDRESSES** below. *Scoping meetings:* Public scoping meetings will be held on Wednesday, October 24, 2001 from 5 p.m. to 8 p.m. at Union Station and on Thursday, October 25, 2001 from 5 p.m. to 8 p.m. at Calvary Temple. An agency scoping meeting will be held Wednesday, October 24, 2001 from 1

p.m. to 3 p.m. at Union Station. See **ADDRESSES** below.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on the project scope of alternatives and impacts to be considered should be sent to James Irish, Sound Transit, 401 South Jackson St., Seattle, WA 98104-2826 by November 9, 2001. Scoping meetings will be held on the following days and locations.

Public Scoping Meetings

Wednesday, October 24, 2001

5 pm-8 pm

Location: Union Station—Great Hall, 401 S. Jackson Street, Seattle, Washington, and

Thursday, October 25, 2001

5 pm-8 pm

Location: Calvary Temple—Children's Auditorium, 6810 8th Avenue NE., Seattle, Washington

Agency Scoping Meeting

Wednesday, October 24, 2001

1 pm-3 pm

Location: Union Station—Sound Transit Board Room, 401 S. Jackson Street, Seattle, Washington

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Witmer, Federal Transit Administration, 915 2nd Avenue Suite 3142, Seattle, WA 98174, Telephone: 206.220.7964 or James Irish, Sound Transit, 401 South Jackson St., Seattle, WA 98104-2826, Telephone: 206.398.5140.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Scoping

The FTA and Sound Transit invite comments from interested individuals, organizations, and federal, state, regional and local agencies for a period of 30 days after publication of this notice (See **DATES** and **ADDRESSES** above). Comments should focus on defining the alternatives within the corridor to be evaluated in the EIS and identifying any significant social, economic, or environmental issues related to the alternatives. An Environmental Scoping Information Report describing the project, the proposed alternatives, the impact areas to be evaluated, the public involvement program and the preliminary project schedule has been prepared. You may request a copy of the report by contacting Anna Mallon, Sound Transit, 401 South Jackson St., Seattle, WA 98104-2826, Telephone: 206.398.5144. In addition to written comments, which may be made at the meetings or as described above, a stenographer will be available at the public meetings to record oral comments. All of the

locations for the scoping meetings are accessible to people with disabilities. Non-English translation services and accessible formats are available by request at 800.201.4900 (voice) or 206.398.5410 (TTY).

II. Study Area and Alternatives

FTA and the Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority (Sound Transit) will prepare a supplemental EIS on route alternatives from Convention Place to Northgate. The study will be divided into three segments: Capitol Hill/South Lake Union (Convention Place Station to SR-520), Ship Canal Crossing/University District (SR-520 to NE 45th Street), and the Northgate segment (NE 45th to Northgate). The supplemental EIS will address the no build alternative and the following light rail station and route options:

Capitol Hill/South Lake Union (Convention Place Station to SR-520)

These include the adopted Capitol Hill route including Capitol Hill station alternatives, an Eastlake Avenue Route, a Bouren Avenue route, and a route bypassing First Hill with stations between Capitol Hill and First Hill and on 15th Avenue.

Ship Canal Crossing/University District (SR-520 to NE 45th Street)

These include the Postage Bay tunnel adopted route, a Montlake tunnel route via the University of Washington's Rainier Vista, a tunnel route in the vicinity of the University bridge, and a high-and/or mid-level bridge.

Northgate Segment (NE 45th to Northgate)

Includes the two 8th Avenue route options, and the 12th Avenue route. A Notice of Intent was issued on April 16, 2001 to prepare a supplemental EIS for the Northgate segment (NE 45th to Northgate) to the project. That supplemental EIS has been terminated. Supplemental environmental review for the Northgate segment of the project will be incorporated in this new supplemental EIS.

III. Probable Effects

This is a supplemental EIS to the Central Link Rail Transit Project Final EIS (November 1999). The FTA and Sound Transit will evaluate all significant environmental, social, and economic impacts of the alternatives analyzed in the supplemental EIS. Impacts will be evaluated for all issues evaluated in the original EIS.

Issued on: September 27, 2001.

Helen Knoll,

Regional Administrator, Region X.

[FR Doc. 01-26559 Filed 10-19-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-57-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2001-10044; Notice 2]

Reliance Trailer Co., LLC; Grant of Application for Temporary Exemption From Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 224

This notice grants the application by Reliance Trailer Co., LLC, of Spokane, Washington ("Reliance"), for a temporary exemption of its dump body trailers from Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 224 *Rear Impact Protection*. The basis of the grant is that compliance would cause substantial economic hardship to a manufacturer that has tried in good faith to comply with the standard.

We published notice of receipt of the application on July 10, 2001, affording an opportunity to comment (66 FR 36032).

Why Reliance Says That It Needs an Exemption

In February 2001, Reliance acquired the assets of SturdyWeld, another Washington company, in order to commence manufacture of "trailers built to mate with asphalt paving equipment." We observed that this appears to be a horizontal discharge trailer that is used in the road construction industry to deliver asphalt and other road building materials to the construction site. However, the sole commenter on the notice, Dan Hill & Associates, pointed out that the trailer is a "dump body/gravity feed" trailer. Dan Hill distinguishes this type of trailer as one that "can handle everything from 9-foot-plus slabs of concrete all the way down to sand, whereas * * * controlled horizontal discharge products are limited to the transportation of hot-mix asphalt and, on occasion, other related processed road-building materials under 2" in size."

Standard No. 224 requires, effective January 26, 1998, that all trailers with a GVWR of 4536 kg or more, including Reliance's trailers, be fitted with a rear impact guard that conforms to Standard No. 223 *Rear impact guards*. Reliance argued that installation of the rear impact guard will prevent its trailers from connecting to the paver and

performing their mission. Thus, its trailers will no longer be functional.

Reliance's Reasons Why It Believes That Compliance Would Cause It Substantial Economic Hardship and That It Has Tried in Good Faith To Comply With Standard No. 224

Reliance is a small volume manufacturer whose total production in the 12-month period preceding its petition was 268 trailers. In the absence of an exemption, Reliance says that "considering the over \$2 million paid for the [SturdyWeld] Division and if we are able to sell the over \$1 million inventory, but have to shut this operation down, we would probably lose over \$1 million." Reliance's cumulative net income after taxes for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000 was \$150,793.

Reliance apparently learned of its compliance problem after producing 26 of the trailers in question. It has determined that these trailers fail to comply with Standard No. 224, and has notified NHTSA pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573. It has also filed a petition for a determination that the noncompliance is inconsequential to safety. Reliance has also discovered that "this is a nationwide, yet unsolved, problem," citing three manufacturers of similar trailers who have received temporary exemptions from Standard No. 224, Beall Trailers, Red River Manufacturing, and Dan Hill Associates.

The petition discusses "possible alternative means of compliance" which "will include the analysis of moveable, replaceable or retractable under-rides. To date these concepts are very difficult to maintain due to the nature of the paving material." After discussion with its customers, Reliance "will proceed to design, build and test prototype designs to meet the regulations and allow dumping asphalt into paving equipment." It believes that it will comply by the end of a two-year exemption period.

Reliance's Reasons Why It Believes That a Temporary Exemption Would Be in the Public Interest and Consistent With Objectives of Motor Vehicle Safety

Reliance argues that an exemption would be in the public interest and consistent with traffic safety objectives because the trailers "represent about 80% of the output of the 38 employees' of the SturdyWeld division, and "if this petition is denied, the operation will be closed and those people will be out of jobs." An exemption would allow it "to continue to provide equipment needed by road building industries to expand