its product line; without an exemption it would be unable to do so.

Bajaj anticipates sales of not more than 2500 scooters a year while an exemption is in effect. It believes that an exemption would be in the public interest and consistent with the objectives of traffic safety because it is intended for low-speed urban use, in ''congested traffic conditions,'' and ''has been tested by long use in India and the rest of the world.'' The petitioner states that ''neither consumer groups nor governmental authorities have raised any safety concerns as a result of this design.'' The scooter provides ''environmentally clean and fuel efficient * * * urban transportation.'' Specifically, ''the exhaust, crankcase, and evaporative emissions of the motor scooter's very small engine have been demonstrated to be lower than alternative means of transportation such as large motorcycles.'' If the exemption is granted, ''the American consumer will be provided with a broader range of choice of low-cost, efficient, transportation.''

Bajaj's application was supported by Jeff Saunders of Palo Alto, California, and three other commenters. In Mr. Saunders' opinion, ''Scooters offer an excellent way for novice riders to learn to operate a motorcycle, particularly due to the automatic transmission, the natural riding position, and the smaller size and weight of scooters as opposed to traditional motorcycles of similar engine size.''

NHTSA has exempted four other motorcycle manufacturers from S5.2.1 (Piaggio, 65 FR 64741; Vectrix, 64 FR 45585); Italjet, 64 FR 58127, and Aprilia, 64 FR 44262). Our concern about a lack of standardization of the rear brake control for scooter-type vehicles was addressed by Aprilia in its petition which included a report on ''Motorscooter Braking Control Study,'' available for examination in Docket No. NHTSA–99–4357. This report indicated that test subjects' brake reaction times using a vehicle configured like the Saffire were approximately 20% quicker than their reaction times on the conventional motorcycle. We interpreted the report as indicating that a rider's braking response is not likely to be degraded by the different placement of brake controls, and cited it in granting the similar petition by Vectrix. In Bajaj's case, the favorable comments appear to sustain our previous conclusions. As we announced in granting Piaggio's petition in October 2000, ''we intend to initiate rulemaking to amend Standard No. 123 to address the location of the brake control on vehicles with automatic transmissions, such as the petitioner manufactures.'' That remains our intent.

With respect to the public interest and the objectives of motor vehicle safety, the overall level of safety, as Bajaj argues, appears at least equal to that of vehicles certified to comply with Standard No. 123. Jeff Saunders comments that an exemption would be in the public interest by making available a compact, fuel-efficient vehicle for urban use that would not otherwise be available without an exemption. According to the comment, this is especially important in an urban location such as San Francisco where parking ''may cost as much as $400 per month but parking for scooters and motorcycles is often free.'' He also relates that ''brakes on the handlebars and the automatic transmission also allow this motorcycle to be ridden (with a sidecar) by handicapped persons with limited leg use, who would otherwise have to have expensive brake and transmission modifications made to vehicles' which comply with Standard No. 123.

In consideration of the foregoing, we hereby find that Bajaj has met its burden of persuasion that, to require compliance with Standard No. 123 would prevent the manufacturer from selling a motor vehicle with an overall level of safety at least equal to the overall safety level of nonexempt vehicles. We further find that a temporary exemption is in the public interest and consistent with the objectives of motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, Bajaj Auto Ltd. is hereby granted NHTSA Temporary Exemption No. EX2001–5 from the requirements 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 Saffire and will expire on June 1, 2003.

(49 U.S.C. 30113; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50)

Issued on July 23, 2001.

L. Robert Shelton,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 01–18762 Filed 7–26–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

July 20, 2001.

The Department of Treasury has submitted the following public information collection requirement(s) to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling the Treasury Bureau Clearance Officer listed. Comments regarding this information collection should be addressed to the OMB reviewer listed and to the Treasury Department Clearance Officer, Department of the Treasury, Room 2110, 1425 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20220.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before August 27, 2001, to be assured of consideration.

Bureau of Engraving and Printing (BEP)

OMB Number: New.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: New collection.

Title: Public Awareness of New Currency Design Feature Focus Groups.

Description: Since 1996, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing (BEP) has been producing Series 1996 Federal Reserve Notes based on a new design with counterfeit deterrence features intended to better enable the general public to recognize genuine currency and distinguish it from counterfeits. BEP is preparing to release the next generation of currency, and is again initiating a new design effort. To aid in effective selection of counterfeit deterrence features for the next design, the BEP is sponsoring a study to assess how well the features in the series 1996 design have worked by evaluating how knowledgeable the public is of the new currency.

Respondents: Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 120.

Estimated Burden Hours Per Response: 2 hours, 67 minutes.

Frequency of Response: Other (one time).

Estimated Total Reporting Burden: 320 hours.

Clearance Officer: Pam Corsini (202) 874–2647 Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Room 3.2.C, Engraving and Printing Annex, 14th and C Streets, SW., Washington, DC 20228.

OMB Reviewer: Alexander T. Hunt (202) 395–7860, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Lois K. Holland,

Departmental Reports Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 01–18701 Filed 7–26–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4840–01–U