end of the performance period. The COTR will review the Draft Final Report and provide comments to the grantee within 30 days of receipt of the document.

(e) *Final Report:* The grantee will revise the Draft Final Report to reflect the COTR's comments. The revised final report will be delivered to the COTR 15 days before the end of the performance period.

(f) *Requirements for Printed Material:* The print materials shall be provided to NHTSA in both camera ready and appropriate media formats (disk, CD-rom) with graphics and printing specifications to guide NHTSA's printing office and any outside organization implementing the program. Printing Specifications follow.

(i) Digital artwork for printing shall be provided to NHTSA on diskette (100MG Zip disk or 1GB Jaz disk). Files should be in current desktop design and publication programs, for example, Adobe Illustrator, Adobe Photoshop, Adobe Pagemaker, Macromedia Freehand, QuarkXPress. The grantee shall provide all supporting files and fonts (both screen and printers) needed for successful output, black and white laser separations of all pages, disk directory(s) with printing specifications provided to the Government Printing Office (GPO) on GPO Form 952 to guide NHTSA's printing office, GPO, and any outside organizations assisting with program production. The grantee shall confer with the COTR to verify all media format and language.

(ii) Additionally, the program materials shall be submitted in the following format for placement on NHTSA's website on the World Wide Web.

- Original application format, for example, *pm5; *.doc; *.ppt; etc
- HTML level 3.2 or later
- A PDF file for viewing with Adobe Acrobat

(iii) All HTML deliverables must be delivered on either a standard 3.5″ floppy disk or on a Windows 95 compatible formatted Iomega zip disk and labeled with the following information:

- Grantee's name and phone number
- Names of relevant files
- Application program and version used to create the file(s).
- If the files exceed the capacity of a high density floppy, a Windows 95 compatible formatted Iomega zip disk is acceptable.

(iv) Graphics must be saved in *Graphic Interchange Format (GIF) or Joint Photographic Expert Group (JPEG).* Graphics should be prepared in the smallest size possible, without reducing the usefulness or the readability of the figure on the screen. Use GIF for solid color or black and white images, such as bar charts, maps, or diagrams. Use JPEG (highest resolution and lowest compression) for photographic images having a wider range of color or grey-scale tones. When in doubt, try both formats and use the one that gives the best image quality for the smallest file size. Graphic files can be embedded in the body of the text or linked from the body text in their own files: the latter is preferable when a figure needs to be viewed full screen (640 x 480 pixels) to be readable.

- Tabular data must be displayed in HTML table format.
- List data must be displayed in HTML list format.
- Pre-formatted text is not acceptable.
- Currently, frames are not acceptable.
- JAVA, if used, must not affect the readability or usefulness of the document, only enhance it.
- Table background colors may be used, but must not be relied upon (for example, a white document background with a table with colored background may look nice with white text, but the colored background doesn't show up on the user's browser the text shall be white against white and unreadable.)
- All HTML documents must be saved in PC format and tested on a PC before delivery.

(v) During all phases of program development, draft program content and materials shall be provided to the COTR, as appropriate, for approval and coordination within NHTSA.

(vi) All HTML deliverables rendered under this cooperative agreement must comply with the accessibility standards at 36 CFR 1194.22 which implements Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended. This standard is available for viewing at the Access Board web site at: *http://www.access-board.gov/sec508/guide/1194.22.htm*

Unless otherwise indicated, the grantee represents by signature of this cooperative agreement that all deliverables comply with the accessibility standards.

(g) Final project briefing to NHTSA and a presentation to a national meeting: The grantee will deliver a briefing in Washington, DC at NHTSA's offices to the COTR and appropriate NHTSA staff to review the project implementation, evaluation, and results. This presentation shall last no less than 30 minutes and the grantee shall be prepared to answer questions from the briefing's attendees.

In consultation with the COTR, the grantee will select a national meeting to deliver a presentation of the project and its effectiveness.

(h) The grantee will deliver an electronic Microsoft PowerPoint (97) presentation that NHTSA staff shall be able to use to brief senior staff or bicycle partners at various meetings and conference.

3. During the effective performance period of the cooperative agreements awarded as a result of this announcement, the agreements shall be subject to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's General Provisions for Assistance Agreement, dated July 1995.

Issued on: April 9, 2002.

Rose A. McMurray,

Associate Administrator for Traffic Safety Programs.

[FR Doc. 02–9137 Filed 4–15–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Denial of Motor Vehicle Defect Petition, DP01–004

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Denial of petition for a defect investigation.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the reasons for the denial of a petition submitted to NHTSA under 49 U.S.C. § 30162, requesting that the agency commence a proceeding to determine the existence of a defect related to motor vehicle safety. The petition is hereinafter identified as DP01–004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Robert Squire, Office of Defects Investigation (ODI), NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, 20590. Telephone 202–493–0212.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Mr. Douglas Fabish submitted a petition to NHTSA by letter dated July 23, 2001, requesting that an investigation be initiated to determine whether to issue an order concerning safety defects in model year 1997 WIA-series Volvo Class 8 truck tractors (subject trucks). The petition alleges that the frame rail cross members are ineffective in maintaining alignment of the two longitudinal frame rails and that the subsequent misalignment creates vehicle control problems, excessive vibration, and increased wear of axle components. The petitioner alleges that the frame rail cross members flex as the vehicle is maneuvered through a turn. The flexing

allegedly creates a misalignment of the frame that in turn creates a ''temporary breech (sic)'' between the frame and axle positioning components. The petitioner asserts that as a result of this breach, or gap, between the frame and axle, inordinate stress is placed on the axle components leading to premature wear of the components and excessive vehicle vibration.

In support of the petition, the petitioner made available to ODI a copy of an engineering analysis he commissioned for his truck. Although the report offered some explanation for the problems the petitioner experienced with his vehicle, ODI has included that the analysis does not support the petitioner's allegations. Specifically, the petitioner's engineering analysis concluded that the frame rails were misaligned and ''over-stressed.'' The analysis failed to explain the methodology used to reach this conclusion or what effect such conditions would have on the vehicle.

A review of complaints filed with NHTSA, regarding all Volvo trucks, revealed none that allege characteristics similar to those expressed by the petitioner. NHTSA has received eight complaints regarding the subject trucks; only one made reference to the frame, and this complaint was related to the vehicle's suspension. Review of additional documentation provided by the petitioner, including his engineering analysis, failed to conclusively identify a cause for the problems exhibited by his vehicle. None of the complaints reviewed, nor personal contacts established by ODI, corroborated the petitioner's conclusion regarding ineffective frame rail cross members.

ODI has no information indicating that misalignment of the truck's frame rails as described by the petitioner has contributed to a collision or injury.

It is unlikely that NHTSA would issue an order for the notification and remedy of alleged frame rail misalignment as described by the petitioner at the conclusion of the investigation requested in the petition. Therefore, in view of the need to allocate and prioritize NHTSA's limited resources to best accomplish the agency's safety mission, the petition is denied.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30162(d); delegations of authority at CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on: April 4, 2002.

Kenneth N. Weinstein,

Associate Administrator for Safety Assurance.

[FR Doc. 02–9136 Filed 4–15–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2002–12048]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1999–2001 Mercedes Benz CLK Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1999–2001 Mercedes Benz CLK 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 1999–2001 Mercedes Benz CLK 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 May 16, 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: George Entwistle, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202–366–5306).

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, L.L.C. of Baltimore, Maryland (''J.K.'') (Registered Importer 90–006) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1999–2001 Mercedes Benz CLK passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles which J.K. believes are substantially similar are 1999–2001 Mercedes Benz CLK 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 1999–2001 Mercedes Benz CLK 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 1999–2001 Mercedes Benz CLK 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 1999–2001 Mercedes Benz CLK passenger cars are identical to their U.S. certified counterparts with respect to compliance with Standard Nos. 102 *Transmission Shift Lever Sequence * * *,* 103 *Defrosting and Defogging Systems,* 104 *Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems,* 105 *Hydraulic Brake Systems,* 106 *Brake Hoses,* 109 *New Pneumatic Tires,* 113 *Hood Latch Systems,* 116 *Brake Fluid,* 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,* 209 *Seat Belt Assemblies,* 210 *Seat Belt Assembly*