**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A) and (b)(1); 49 CFR 593.8; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on: October 1, 2002.

#### Marilynne Jacobs,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance. [FR Doc. 02–25409 Filed 10–4–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910-59–P

# **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

# National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2002-13382]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1999 and 2000 Bimota SB8 and 2000 Bimota DB4 Motorcycles Are Eligible for Importation

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1999 and 2000 Bimota SB8 and 2000 Bimota DB4 motorcycles are eligible for importation.

**SUMMARY:** This document announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that 1999 and 2000 Bimota SB8 and 2000 Bimota DB4 motorcycles 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.

**DATE:** The closing date for comments on the petition is November 6, 2002.

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.]

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Luke Loy, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202–366–5308).

#### 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** 

DC Imports, Inc. of Deerfield Beach, Florida ("DCI") (Registered Importer 0-242) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether non-U.S. certified 1999 and 2000 Bimota SB8 and 2000 Bimota DB4 motorcycles are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles that DCI believes are substantially similar are 1999 and 2000 Bimota SB8 and 2000 Bimota DB4 motorcycles that were manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States and certified by their manufacturer, Bimota Motor S.p.A. of Rimini, Italy, as conforming to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared non-U.S. certified 1999 and 2000 Bimota SB8 and 2000 Bimota DB4 motorcycles 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.

DCI submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 1999 and 2000 Bimota SB8 and 2000 Bimota DB4 motorcycles, 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 1999 and 2000 Bimota SB8 and 2000 Bimota DB4 motorcycles are identical to their U.S. certified counterparts with respect to compliance with Standard Nos. 111 Rearview Mirrors, 116 Brake Fluid, 119 New Pneumatic Tires for Vehicles other

than Passenger Cars, 122 Motorcycle Brake Systems, and 205 Glazing Materials.

The petitioner also states that vehicle identification number (VIN) plates that meet the requirements of 49 CFR part 565 have been affixed to non-U.S. certified 1999 and 2000 Bimota SB8 and 2000 Bimota DB4 motorcycles.

Petitioner additionally contends that the vehicles are capable of being readily altered to meet the following standards, in the manner indicated below:

Standard No. 106 *Brake Hoses*: Installation of a flexible conduit/brake hose that is certified to meet the standard.

Standard No. 108 Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment: (a) Installation of U.S.-model headlamp assemblies incorporating headlamps that are certified to meet the standard; (b) installation of a cable that will allow the headlamp to be steady-burning when the ignition is in the "on" position.

Standard No. 120 *Tire Selection and Rims for Vehicles other than Passenger Cars*: installation of a tire information label.

Standard No. 123 Motorcycle Controls and Displays: (a) Installation of a U.S. model speedometer calibrated in miles per hour; (b) installation of passenger footrests that fold rearward and upward when not in use.

The petitioner states that when the vehicle has been brought into conformity with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards, a certification label that meets the requirements of 49 CFR part 567 will be affixed to the front of the motorcycle frame.

Comments should refer to the docket number and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. It is requested but not required that 10 copies be submitted.

All comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated above will be considered, and will be available for examination in the docket at the above address both before and after that date. To the extent possible, comments filed after the closing date will also be considered. Notice of final action on the petition will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A) and (b)(1); 49 CFR 593.8; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on: October 1, 2002.

#### Marilynne Jacobs,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance. [FR Doc. 02–25410 Filed 10–4–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

# National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA 2002-13355; Notice 1]

# Bridgestone/Firestone; Receipt of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Bridgestone/Firestone has determined that approximately 4,700 P235/75R15 Dayton Timberline A/T tires do not meet the labeling requirements mandated by Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 109, "New Pneumatic Tires." Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h), Bridgestone/Firestone has petitioned for a determination that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety and has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports."

This notice of receipt of an application is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the application.

The Sao Paulo, Brazil plant produced these noncompliant tires during the week 40 through and including week 49 of the year 2001. The subject tires were mismarked as "Extra Load." The actual markings on the subject tires are:

Max load 920 Kg (2028 lbs.) at 300 kPa (44 psi) max press, Extra Load. The correct markings should be:

Max load 920 Kg (2028 lbs.) at 300 kPa (44 psi) max press.

Bridgestone/Firestone believes that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety for the following reasons:

- 1. The subject tires with the exception of the "Extra Load" marking meet all the requirements of 49 CFR Section 571.109.
- 2. The subject tires were tested by Bridgestone/Firestone and meet the requirements of high speed, endurance, strength, and bead unseat as defined in 49 CFR Section 571.109 for the "Extra Load" designation.
- 3. The subject tires as shipped from the manufacturing plant were identified by tire labels and article number as standard load. Thus, the potential for sale of these tires as "Extra Load" is very small.

Bridgestone/Firestone submits that mismarking of the subject tires should be deemed inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on the application described above. Comments should refer to the docket number and be submitted to: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Management, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. It is requested that two copies be submitted.

All comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated below will be considered. The application and supporting materials, and all comments received after the closing date, will also be filed and will be considered to the extent possible. When the application is granted or denied, the notice will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below. Comment closing date: November 6, 2002.

(49 U.S.C. 301118, 301120; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8)

Issued on October 1, 2002.

#### Stephen R. Kratzke,

Associate Administrator for Rulemaking. [FR Doc. 02–25408 Filed 10–4–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

# **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA 2002-13356; Notice 1]

# Cooper Tire & Rubber Company; Receipt of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Cooper Tire & Rubber Company (Cooper) has determined that approximately 956 Cooper Lifeliner Touring SLE tires in the 185/70R14 size do not meet the labeling requirements mandated by Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 109, "New Pneumatic Tires." Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h), Cooper has petitioned for a determination that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety and has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports."

This notice of receipt of an application is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the application.

The Texarkana, Arkansas, tire manufacturing facility had one mold

involved in production during the twelfth and thirteenth production weeks of 2002, in which the plant identification code was incorrectly stated. The subject tires were molded "DOT VT". The correct molding for the Texarkana, Arkansas plant identification code should have been DOT UT". The incorrect plant identification code was removed from the mold and the correct plant identification code inserted.

Cooper states that the incorrect plant identification code on each tire does not present "a safety-related defect" (sic). Their tire registration system will be programmed to register these tires with the incorrect plant identification code. In the event of a recall, this same system will identify the tire registrations with the incorrect plant identification code. The involved tires produced from these molds comply with all other requirements of 49 CFR 571.109.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on the application described above. Comments should refer to the docket number and be submitted to: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Management, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. It is requested that two copies be submitted.

All comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated below will be considered. The application and supporting materials, and all comments received after the closing date, will also be filed and will be considered to the extent possible. When the application is granted or denied, the notice will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

Comment closing date: November 6, 2002.

(49 U.S.C. 301118, 301120; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8)

Issued on: October 1, 2002.

# Stephen R. Kratzke,

Associate Administrator for Rulemaking. [FR Doc. 02–25407 Filed 10–4–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

# **Surface Transportation Board**

[STB Finance Docket No. 34242 (Sub-No. 1)]

Union Pacific Railroad Company-Trackage Rights Exemption-The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Co.

**AGENCY:** Surface Transportation Board, DOT.