less than $50 million (including all project elements) and less than $3 million per mile, exclusive of rolling stock.

Majority of Funds Will Go to Very Small Starts Projects Due to the Ease of Evaluation and Implementation

Comments: A total of 11 comments were received. Respondents noted concern that since Very Small Starts projects would have an easier time being rated, that the majority of Small Starts funding would be allocated to Very Small Starts projects. This would mean that very little funding would be available for larger Small Starts, such as fixed guideway rail projects.

FTA Response: The comments are not based on any requirement in the Proposed Interim Guidance, but rather reflect speculation on how FTA will make funding recommendations. The Proposed Interim Guidance did not address how FTA would make its funding decisions, nor did it address the division of funding between Small Starts and Very Small Starts. As with all projects in the Section 5309 capital investment grant program, the evaluation and rating process for Small Starts is separate and distinct from FTA's decision to recommend a project for funding. That decision is driven by a number of factors, including the ''readiness'' of projects for capital funding, geographic equity, the amount of available funds versus the number and size of the projects in New Starts the pipeline, and the project's overall rating. The Interim Guidance and Instructions have been revised to add a section that clearly states that funding decisions are not covered by the rating process.

Requirement for 1,000 Riders at Endpoints Is Too High for Very Small Starts

Comments: A total of 11 comments were received. Respondents representing both large and small transit agencies, as well as trade organizations, noted that this metric would be difficult to meet. Most respondents noted that this requirement could be met at one end or at points along a route, but achieving 1,000 riders at each endpoint is not likely.

FTA Response: In light of the projected variety of project candidates for Very Small Starts funding, this minimum ridership requirement has been be eliminated in the Interim Guidance and Instructions. However, as with any proposed New Start project, FTA will review the scope and cost of the project to insure that significant costs are not being incurred for unproductive lengths.

Request for Simpler Processes

Comments: A total of 12 comments were received. Respondents noted that the application process for Small Starts funding was too cumbersome in relation to the program's goals and expected project size. Several comments cited similarities between the application process for New Starts and Small Starts. Respondents noted the number of long, involved, and often costly steps in New Starts projects, and hoped to avoid these in the Small Starts program.

FTA Response: FTA believes that significant simplification has been achieved, consistent with the underlying premise of the Proposed Interim Guidance not to make major changes in the process until the rulemaking has been completed. Nevertheless, FTA believes that further simplification may be possible. The rulemaking process underway for New Starts and Small Starts will provide an opportunity to consider additional simplification. The requirements for an alternatives analysis and the information necessary for local financial commitment have been simplified. For Very Small Starts, evidence of eligibility, which is information project sponsors usually develop for a project regardless of funding source, is all that is required for project justification. The timeframe for travel forecasts and financial plans has been reduced to the date of opening, significantly reducing highway and transit network development as well as other information needed for forecasts. Simplified methods for travel forecasts are also possible. The planning and evaluation process has been limited to the factors in the law and the amount of supporting information has been minimized as much as possible without compromising evaluation of project justification and local financial commitment. In addition, in response to the comments, the information required for the rating of land use has been further simplified and included in the Appendix.

Issued in Washington, DC this 2nd day of August 2006.

Sandra K. Bushue,

Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. E6–12847 Filed 8–7–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–57–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

Reports, Forms and Recordkeeping Requirements; Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces that the Information Collection abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval. The nature of the information collection is described as well as its expected burden. The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on the following collection of information was published on May 16, 2006. No comments were received.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before September 7, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Zok, Maritime Administration (MAR–500), 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: 202–366–0364; FAX: 202–366–9580, or e-mail: *jim.zok@dot.gov.*

Copies of this collection also can be obtained from that office.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Maritime Administration (MARAD).

Title of Collection: Customer Service Survey.

OMB Control Number: 2133–0528.

Type of Request: Extension of currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Individuals receiving goods and services from the Maritime Administration.

Forms: MA–1016, MA–1017, MA–1021 and MA–1038.

Abstract: Executive Order 12862 requires agencies to survey customers to determine the kind and quality of services they want and the level of satisfaction with existing services. This collection provides the instruments used to collect the information regarding MARAD programs and services.

Annual Estimated Burden Hours: 256 hours.

Addresses: Send comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention: MARAD Desk Officer.

Comments Are Invited On: (A) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper

performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

A comment to OMB is best assured of having its full effect if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication.

Issued in Washington, DC on August 2, 2006.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–12844 Filed 8–7–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2006–25515]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 2004 Mercedes Benz Maybach Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 2004 Mercedes Benz Maybach passenger cars are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This document announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that 2004 Mercedes Benz Maybach passenger cars that were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are eligible for importation into the United States because (1) they are substantially similar to vehicles that were originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States and that were certified by their manufacturer as complying with the safety standards, and (2) they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the petition is September 7, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to the docket number and notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590. [Docket hours are from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.] Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.) You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477–78) or you may visit *http://dms.dot.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Coleman Sachs, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202–366–3151).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A), a motor vehicle that was not originally manufactured to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards shall be refused admission into the United States unless NHTSA has decided that the motor vehicle is substantially similar to a motor vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States, certified under 49 U.S.C. 30115, and of the same model year as the model of the motor vehicle to be compared, and is capable of being readily altered to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Petitions for eligibility decisions may be submitted by either manufacturers or importers who have registered with NHTSA pursuant to 49 CFR Part 592. As specified in 49 CFR 593.7, NHTSA publishes notice in the **Federal Register** of each petition that it receives, and affords interested persons an opportunity to comment on the petition. At the close of the comment period, NHTSA decides, on the basis of the petition and any comments that it has received, whether the vehicle is eligible for importation. The agency then publishes this decision in the **Federal Register**.

J.K. Technologies, LLC, of Baltimore, Maryland (''J.K.'')(Registered Importer 90–006) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether nonconforming 2004 Mercedes Benz Maybach passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles which J.K. believes are substantially similar are 2004 Mercedes Benz Maybach passenger cars that were manufactured for importation into, and sale in, the United States and certified by their manufacturer as conforming to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared non-U.S. certified 2004 Mercedes Benz Maybach passenger cars to their U.S.-certified counterparts, and found the vehicles to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

J.K. submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 2004 Mercedes Benz Maybach passenger cars, as originally manufactured, conform to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as their U.S. certified counterparts, or are capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that non-U.S. certified 2004 Mercedes Benz Maybach passenger cars are identical to their U.S. certified counterparts with respect to compliance with Standard Nos. 102 *Transmission Shift Lever Sequence, Starter Interlock, and Transmission Braking Effect*, 103 *Windshield Defrosting and Defogging Systems*, 104 *Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems*, 106 *Brake Hoses*, 109 *New Pneumatic Tires*, 113 *Hood Latch System*, 116 *Motor Vehicle Brake Fluids*, 124 *Accelerator Control Systems*, 135 *Passenger Car Brake Systems*, 201 *Occupant Protection in Interior Impact*, 202 *Head Restraints*, 204 *Steering Control Rearward Displacement*, 205 *Glazing Materials*, 206 *Door Locks and Door Retention Components*, 207 *Seating Systems*, Standard No. 209 *Seat Belt Assemblies*, 210 *Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages*, 212 *Windshield Mounting*, 214 *Side Impact Protection*, 216 *Roof Crush Resistance*, 219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion*, 225 *Child Restraint Anchorage Systems*, 301 *Fuel System Integrity*, 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials*, and 401 *Interior Trunk Release*.

In addition, the petitioner claims that the vehicles comply with the Bumper Standard found in 49 CFR Part 581.

The petitioner also contends that the vehicles are capable of being readily altered to meet the following standards, in the manner indicated:

Standard No. 101 *Controls and Displays:* Installation of a U.S.-model instrument cluster.

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment:* (a) Installation of U.S.-model front sidemarker lamps; (b) installation of U.S.-model headlamps; and (c) installation of U.S.-model taillamp assemblies which incorporate rear U.S.-model sidemarker lamps.

Standard No. 110 *Tire Selection and Rims:* Installation of a tire information placard.

Standard No. 111 *Rearview Mirrors:* Installation of a U.S.-model passenger side rearview mirror, or inscription of