significant technical advantages, as compared with proposals previously received.

(1) Additional Guidelines Applicable to Foreign Proposals and Proposals Including Foreign Participation.

(1) NASA welcomes proposals from outside the U.S. However, foreign entities are generally not eligible for funding from NASA. Therefore, proposals from foreign entities should not include a cost plan unless the proposal involves collaboration with a U.S. institution in which case a cost plan for only the participation of the U.S. entity must be included (unless otherwise noted in the NRA). Proposals from foreign entities and proposals from U.S. entities that include foreign participation must be endorsed by the respective government agency or funding/sponsoring institution in the country from which the non-U.S. participant is proposing. Such endorsement should indicate that the proposal merits careful consideration by NASA, and if the proposal is selected, sufficient funds will be made available to undertake the activity as proposed.

(2) When a “Notice of Intent” to propose is required, prospective foreign proposers should write directly to the NASA official designated in the NRA and send a copy of this letter to NASA’s Office of External Relations at the address in paragraph (l)(3) of this provision.

(3) In addition to sending the requested number of copies of the proposal to the designated address, one copy of the proposal, along with the Letter of Endorsement from the sponsor, non-U.S. government agency or funding/sponsoring institution must be forwarded to: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Code I, Office of External Relations, Washington, DC 20546–0001, USA.

(4) All foreign proposals must be typewritten in English and comply with all other submission requirements stated in the NRA. All foreign proposals will undergo the same evaluation and selection process as those originating in the U.S. All proposals must be received before the established closing date. Those received after the closing date will be treated in accordance with paragraph (g) of this provision. Sponsoring foreign government agencies or funding institutions may, in exceptional situations, forward a proposal without endorsement to the above address if endorsement is not possible before the announced closing date. In such cases, NASA’s Office of External Relations should be advised when a decision on endorsement can be expected.

(5) Successful and unsuccessful non-U.S. proposers will be contacted directly by the NASA sponsoring office. Copies of these letters will be sent to the sponsoring government agency or funding institution. Should a foreign proposal or a U.S. proposal with foreign participation be selected, NASA’s Office of External Relations will arrange with the foreign sponsoring agency or funding institution for the proposed participation on a no-exchange-of-funds basis, in which NASA and the non-U.S. sponsoring agency or funding institution will each bear the cost of discharging their respective responsibilities.

(6) Depending on the nature and extent of the proposed cooperation, this arrangement may entail:

(a) A Letter of Notification by NASA;
(b) An exchange of letters between NASA and the sponsoring foreign governmental agency;
(iii) A formal Agency-to-Agency Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

PART 1872—ACQUISITION OF INVESTIGATIONS

11. Section 1872.306 is revised to read as follows:

1872.306 Announcement of opportunity soliciting foreign participation.

Foreign proposals or U.S. proposals with foreign participation shall be treated in accordance with 1835.016–70. An additional guideline applicable to foreign proposers are contained in the Management Plan Section of Appendix B and must be included in any Guidelines for Proposal Preparation or otherwise furnished to foreign proposers.

12. In paragraphs (b)(6), (c) introductory text, and (d) to section 1872.504, the phrase “International Affairs Division,” is removed.

13. In section 1872.705–1, paragraph VII is revised to read as follows:

1872.705–1 Appendix A: General Instructions and Provisions.

VII. Late Proposals

Proposals or proposal modifications received after the latest date specified for receipt may be considered if a significant reduction in cost to the Government is probable or if there are significant technical advantages, as compared with proposals previously received.

14. In section 1872.705–2, paragraphs (a)(3)(i), (ii), (iv), (vi) and the introductory text of paragraph (a)(3)(viii) of the Management Plan and Cost Plan are revised, paragraph (b)(e) is redesignated as (b)(3) and paragraph (b)(4) is added to read as follows:

1872.705–2, Appendix B: Guidelines for Proposal Preparation

Management Plan and Cost Plan

(a) * * *

(3) * * *

(i) Where a “Notice of Intent” to propose is requested, prospective foreign proposers should write directly to the NASA official designated in the AO and send a copy of this letter to NASA, Code I, Office of External Relations, Washington, DC 20546, USA.

(ii) Unless otherwise indicated in the AO, proposals will be submitted in accordance with this Appendix. Proposals should be typewritten and written in English. Foreign entities are generally not eligible for funding from NASA. Therefore, proposals from foreign entities should not include a cost plan unless the proposal involves collaboration with a U.S. institution, in which case a cost plan for only the participation of the U.S. entity must be included (unless otherwise noted in the AO).

(iv) Proposals including the requested number of copies and letters of endorsement from the foreign governmental agency must be forwarded to NASA in time to arrive before the deadline established for each AO. These documents should be sent to: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Code I, Office of External Relations, Washington, DC 20546, U.S.A.

(vi) Shortly after the deadline for each AO, NASA’s Office of External Relations will advise the appropriate sponsoring agency which proposals have been received and when the selection process should be completed. A copy of this acknowledgment will be provided to each proposer.

(b) * * *

(viii) NASA’s Office of External Relations will then begin making the arrangements to provide for the selectee’s participation in the appropriate NASA program. Depending on the nature and extent of the proposed cooperation, these arrangements may entail:

(b) * * *

(4) Use of NASA funds. NASA funding may not be used for foreign research efforts at any level, whether as a collaborator or a subcontract. The direct purchase of supplies and/or services, which do not constitute research, from non-U.S. sources by U.S. award recipients is permitted. Additionally, in accordance with the National Space Transportation Policy, use of a non-U.S. manufactured launch vehicle is permitted only on a no-exchange-of-funds basis.

[FR Doc. 99–23065 Filed 9–3–99; 8:45 am]
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SUMMARY: On March 10, 1995, we published in the Federal Register (60 FR 13297) a final rule establishing
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stopping distance requirements for hydraulically-braked vehicles with gross vehicle weight ratings (GVWR) greater than 10,000 pounds. The requirements specified the distances in which different types of medium and heavy vehicles must come to a stop from 60 mph. There was an error in that rule with regard to Table II—Stopping Distances, which contains the applicable stopping distance requirements. The superscripts in the table identifying specifications for school buses were misplaced. This rule amends the hydraulic brake standard to correct the location of the superscripts in Table II.

DATES: The correcting amendments to Table II are effective October 7, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
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I. Background

A. March 10, 1995, Final Rule, Stopping Distance Requirements for Vehicles Equipped With Hydraulic Brake Systems

On March 10, 1995, we published a final rule, Docket No. 93–07, Notice 3, which, among other things, established stopping distance requirements in Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 105, Hydraulic Brake Systems, for hydraulically-braked vehicles with GVWRs of over 10,000 pounds (60 FR 13297). The rule specified the distances in which different types of medium and heavy vehicles must come to a stop from a speed of 60 miles per hour (mph) on a high coefficient of friction surface. The rule also established a stopping distance requirement of 70 feet (ft.) for a 30-mph second effectiveness test applicable to school buses.

B. Petition for Reconsideration of the March 10, 1995, Final Rule

Navistar International Transportation Corporation (Navistar) filed a Petition for Reconsideration on April 5, 1995, requesting that we increase the stopping distance requirement for the 30-mph second effectiveness test for school buses from 70 ft to 78 ft or in the alternative, to delete the requirement altogether. Navistar indicated in its petition that “significant development work would be required” to bring school buses into compliance with the 70-ft. stopping requirement. Single unit vehicles other than school buses are allowed a distance of 78 ft. for the 30 mph second effectiveness test, although at this time the standard does not require a 30 mph second effectiveness test for non-school bus vehicles with GVWRs greater than 10,000 pounds.

II. December 13, 1995, Final Rule, Petitions for Reconsideration

NHTSA published a Final Rule, Petitions for Reconsideration, on December 13, 1995 (60 FR 63965), responding to the petitions received in response to the Final Rule of March 10, 1995. We stated in Section X D. of the preamble that Table II, which contains the stopping distance requirements for Standard No. 105, would be corrected in that notice. However, a correction to Table II was inadvertently omitted from the December 1995 final rule.

III. Discussion

A. School Bus Stopping Distance for 30-mph Test

Navistar again petitioned us on September 18, 1998, to correct the errors in Table II of Standard No. 105. Specifically, that company stated that the 30-mph stopping distance in the second effectiveness test for school buses should be changed from 70 feet to 78 feet. Additionally, Navistar cited the errors in the location of the superscripts that designate the test applicability and vehicle type for the 30-mph second effectiveness test stopping distances.

We believe that Navistar did not provide sufficient justification for the economic hardship cited and also continue to believe that the 70-ft. stopping distance requirement for school buses can be achieved without significant economic burden for manufacturers. No other school bus manufacturer has reported any hardship in meeting the 70-ft. stopping distance requirement. When we contacted Navistar to ask for some additional information about the hardship, that company indicated it was withdrawing its request that the stopping distance be increased. Therefore, no change is being made to the existing school bus stopping distance requirements.

B. Correction of Table II

This document corrects Table II of Standard No. 105 to move the superscripts 1 and 2 from column d to column e in the second effectiveness test for school buses. As previously stated, the agency inadvertently omitted this change to the standard in the December 13, 1995, final rule.

C. Good Cause

We find for good cause that notice and the opportunity to comment on this correction are unnecessary and contrary to the public interest. This document corrects an obvious error that was not corrected three years ago. The erroneous superscripts that currently appear in Table II can only confuse and mislead the public about the requirements for school bus braking performance.

IV. Rulemaking Analyses and Notices

A. Executive Order 12866 and DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures

This notice has not been reviewed under Executive Order 12866. NHTSA has considered the impacts of this rulemaking action and determined that it is not “significant” within the meaning of the Department of Transportation’s regulatory policies and procedures. In connection with the March 1995 final rules, the agency prepared a Final Regulatory Evaluation (FRE) describing the economic and other effects of this rulemaking action. For persons wishing to examine the full analysis, a copy is in the agency’s public docket.

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

NHTSA has also considered the effects of this correction notice under the Regulatory Flexibility Act. I hereby certify that it will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Accordingly, the agency has not prepared a final regulatory flexibility analysis.

NHTSA concluded that the March 1995 final rule had no significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. Today’s correction notice also will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.
C. National Environmental Policy Act

NHTSA has analyzed this rulemaking action for the purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act. The agency has determined that implementation of this action will not have any significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

D. Executive Order 12612 (Federalism)

NHTSA has analyzed this action under the principles and criteria in Executive Order 12612. The agency has determined that this notice does not have sufficient Federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment. No State laws will be affected.

E. Civil Justice Reform

This final rule does not have any retroactive effect. Under 49 U.S.C. 30103, whenever a Federal motor vehicle safety standard is in effect, a State may not adopt or maintain a safety standard applicable to the same aspect of performance which is not identical to the Federal standard, except to the extent that the State requirement imposes a higher level of performance and applies only to vehicles procured for the State's use. 49 U.S.C. 30161 sets forth a procedure for judicial review of final rules establishing, amending or revoking Federal motor vehicle safety standards. That section does not require submission of a petition for reconsideration or other administrative proceedings before parties may file suit in court.

List of Subjects in 49 CFR Part 571

Imports, Motor vehicle safety, Motor vehicles, Rubber and rubber products, Tires.

In consideration of the foregoing, the agency amends 49 CFR, Part 571, as follows:

PART 571—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 571 continues to read as follows:


§ 571.105 [Amended]

2. Section 571.105 is amended by revising Table II to read as follows:

### TABLE II - STOPPING DISTANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Test Speed (miles per hour)</th>
<th>I-1st (preburnished &amp; 4th effectiveness; spike effectiveness check)</th>
<th>II-2d effectiveness</th>
<th>III-3d (lightly loaded vehicles) effectiveness</th>
<th>IV-Inoperative brake power and power assist unit; partial failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1269 (1st)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Distance for specified tests. 2 Applicable to school buses only. NA = Not applicable

Note: (a) Passenger cars; (b) vehicles other than passenger cars with GVWR of less than 8,000 lbs; (c) Vehicles with GVWR of not less than 8,000 lbs and not more than 10,000 lbs; (d) Vehicles, other than buses, with GVWR greater than 10,000 lbs; (e) Buses, including school buses, with GVWR greater than 10,000 lbs.
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§ 575.104 Uniform tire quality grading standards.

(e) * * *

(2) * * *

(i) * * *

(E) * * *

(2) * * *

Projected mileage &= \frac{-1000\text{(Yo - 62)}}{mc} + 800

* * *

Billings Code 1505-01-D

L. Robert Shelton,
Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 99-23226 Filed 9-3-99; 8:45 am]
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