

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**.

SuperBike Racing, Inc. of Valdosta, Georgia ("SRI") (Registered Importer 1-286) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether non-U.S. certified 1996 Honda CB750 (CB750F2T) motorcycles are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles that SRI believes are substantially similar are 1996 Honda CB750 (Nighthawk) motorcycles that were manufactured for 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 1996

Honda CB750 (CB750F2T) 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.

SRI submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 1996 Honda CB750 (CB750F2T) 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 1996 Honda CB750 (CB750F2T) motorcycles are identical to their U.S. certified counterparts with respect to compliance with Standard Nos. 106 *Brake Hoses*, 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 further contends that the vehicles are capable of being readily altered to meet the following standards, in the manner indicated below:

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment*: (a) Installation of U.S.-model headlamp assemblies, which incorporate headlamps that are certified to DOT requirements; (b) replacement of all stop lamp and directional bulbs with ones that are certified to DOT requirements; (c) replacement of all lenses and housings (if needed) with ones that are certified to DOT requirements.

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

Standard No. 123 *Motorcycle Controls and Displays*: installation of a U.S.-model speedometer reading in miles per hour and a U.S.-model odometer reading in miles.

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: April 2, 2004.

Kenneth N. Weinstein,
Associate Administrator for Enforcement.
[FR Doc. 04-7883 Filed 4-6-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2004-17473]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 2002-2004 Porsche 911(996) Carrera Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 2002-2004 Porsche 911(996) Carrera 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 2002-2004 Porsche 911 (996) Carrera 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 7, 2004.

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**.

US SPECS (Registered Importer 03-321) of Aberdeen, Maryland has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 2002-2004 Porsche 911 (996) Carrera passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles that U.S. SPECS believes are substantially similar are 2002-2004 Porsche 911 (996) Carrera 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 compared non-U.S. certified 2002-2004 Porsche 911 (996) Carrera 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.

US SPECS submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 2002-2004 Porsche 911 (996) Carrera 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 2002-2004 Porsche 911 (996) Carrera 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*, 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*, 210 *Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages*, 212 *Windshield Mounting*, 214 *Side Impact Protection*, 216 *Roof Crush Resistance*, 219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion*, 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials*, and 401 *Interior Trunk Release*.

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*: Modification of the speedometer so that it is calibrated in miles per hour (MPH).

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment*: Installation of the following components on vehicles that are not already so equipped: (a) U.S.-model headlamps and front sidemarker lights; (b) U.S.-model taillamp assemblies, which incorporate rear sidemarker lights; (c) U.S.-model high-mounted stop light assembly; (d) compliant front and rear side reflex reflectors.

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

Standard No. 111 *Rearview Mirrors*: Inscription of the required warning statement on the passenger side rearview mirror, or replacement of that mirror with a U.S.-model component.

Standard No. 114 *Theft Protection*: Installation of a key warning buzzer if the vehicles are not already so equipped.

Standard No. 118 *Power-Operated Window Partition, and Roof Panel Systems*: Programming of the vehicles or rewiring them, as required, to ensure compliance with the standard.

Standard No. 201 *Occupant Protection In Interior Impact*: Inspection of all vehicles and installation of U.S.-model components, as necessary, to ensure compliance with the standard. The petitioner expressed the belief that

the vehicles do in fact comply with the standard.

Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*: (a) Installation of an audible warning buzzer which is wired to the seat belt latches to ensure that the seat belt warning system activates in the proper manner; (b) inspection of all vehicles and installation of U.S.-model components, as necessary, to ensure compliance with the standard. The petitioner states that the vehicles are equipped with a seat belt warning lamp that is identical to the component used on the vehicles' U.S.-certified counterparts. The petitioner further states that the vehicles are equipped with dual front air bags and knee bolsters, and with combination lap and shoulder belts at the front and rear outboard seating positions that are self-tensioning and released by means of a single red push button.

Standard No. 209 *Seat Belt Assemblies*: inspection of all vehicles and installation of U.S.-model passenger side components, if not already so equipped, to ensure compliance with the standard. The petitioner expressed the belief that the vehicles do in fact comply with the standard.

Standard No. 225 *Child Restraint Anchorage Systems*: inspection of all vehicles and installation of U.S.-model components, as necessary, to ensure compliance with the standard.

301 *Fuel System Integrity*: Inspection of all vehicles and installation of U.S.-model components on vehicles that are not already so equipped, to ensure compliance with the standard.

Petitioner states that all vehicles must be inspected to ensure compliance with the Bumper Standard found at 49 CFR part 581 and that U.S.-model components will be installed, as necessary on vehicles that are not already so equipped. The petitioner expressed the belief that the vehicles do in fact comply with this standard.

The petitioner states that the vehicles are exempt from the Theft Prevention Standard at 49 CFR part 541 because they are equipped with anti-theft devices.

The petitioner also states that a vehicle identification plate must be affixed to the vehicles near the left windshield post to meet the requirements of 49 CFR part 565.

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on the petition described above. Comments should refer to the docket 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.) 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: April 2, 2004.

Kenneth N. Weinstein,

Associate Administrator for Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 04-7884 Filed 4-6-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 34480]

Chestnut Ridge Railroad Corporation—Acquisition and Operation Exemption—Chestnut Ridge Railway Company

Chestnut Ridge Railroad Corporation (CHR), a noncarrier subsidiary of Horsehead Corp. (Horsehead), has filed a verified notice of exemption under 49 CFR 1150.31 to acquire and operate approximately 6.6 miles of rail line formerly operated by Chestnut Ridge Railway Company (Chestnut), extending from a connection with the Norfolk Southern Railway Company at Chestnut's milepost 0.0 in Palmerton, PA, to milepost 6.6 in Carbon County, PA.¹

CHR certifies that its annual revenues as a result of this transaction will not result in the creation of a Class I or Class II rail carrier and that its revenues will not exceed \$5 million.

The parties indicate that they intend to consummate the transaction as promptly as possible after March 15, 2004, the effective date of the exemption (7 days after the exemption was filed).

If the notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio*. Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of

a petition to revoke will not automatically stay the transaction.

An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to STB Finance Docket No. 34480, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, DC 20423-0001. In addition, one copy of each pleading must be served on Donald G. Avery, Slover & Loftus, 1224 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036.

Board decisions and notices are available on our Web site at www.stb.dot.gov.

Decided: March 23, 2004.

By the Board, Joseph H. Dettmar, Acting Director, Office of Proceedings.

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 04-7072 Filed 4-6-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 34484]

James Riffin d/b/a the Northern Central Railroad—Acquisition and Operation Exemption—in York County, PA and Baltimore County, MD

James Riffin d/b/a the Northern Central Railroad (NCR), a noncarrier, has filed a verified notice of exemption under 49 CFR 1150.31 to acquire and operate approximately: (a) 20.9 miles of rail line from the Commissioners of York County, PA (Conrail's former Line Code 1224) between milepost 35.1 (at the Maryland/Pennsylvania line), and milepost 56 (Grantly), in York County, PA; (b) 2.0 miles of abandoned rail line (Conrail's former Line Code 1224) between milepost 14.2 (Cockeysville) and milepost 16.2 (Asland), in Baltimore County, MD; and (c) 0.9 miles of abandoned rail line (Conrail's former line Code 1224) between milepost 24.3 (Blue Mount) and milepost 25.2 (Blue Mount Quarry), in Baltimore County, MD.¹ NCR proposes to interchange with the Genesee and Wyoming Railroad.

NCR certifies that its projected annual revenues as a result of this transaction will not exceed those that would qualify it as a Class III rail carrier and states that such revenues will not exceed \$5 million annually. NCR intends to commence these activities within 90

days from the date the notice of exemption was filed (March 8, 2004).

If the verified notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio*. Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of a petition to revoke will not automatically stay the transaction.

An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to STB Finance Docket No. 34484, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board, 1925 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20423-0001. In addition, a copy of each pleading must be served on James Riffin, 1941 Greenspring Drive, Timonium, MD 21093.

Board decisions and notices are available on our Web site at www.stb.dot.gov.

Decided: March 25, 2004.

By the Board, Joseph H. Dettmar, Acting Director, Office of Proceedings.

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 04-7326 Filed 4-6-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 34476]

Progressive Rail, Incorporated—Acquisition and Operation Exemption—Rail Lines of Union Pacific Railroad Company

Progressive Rail, Incorporated (PGR), a Class III rail carrier, has filed a verified notice of exemption under 49 CFR 1150.41 to acquire by lease from Union Pacific Railroad Company (UP) and operate approximately 17.0 miles of rail line in Dakota and Scott Counties, MN. The lines consist of the Canon Falls Branch between milepost 58.1 at or near Northfield, MN, and milepost 73.7 at or near Canon Falls, MN (15.6 miles), and the Faribault Industrial Lead between milepost 44.4 and milepost 45.8 at or near Faribault, MN (1.4 miles). The transaction also includes incidental trackage rights assigned by UP to PGR over the Canadian Pacific Railway Company between Northfield and Comus, MN, and over the Iowa, Chicago and Eastern Railroad Corp. between Comus and Faribault.

PGR certifies that its projected annual revenues as a result of this transaction do not exceed those that would qualify it as a Class III rail carrier, and that such revenues will not exceed \$5 million annually.

¹In a decision served on March 12, 2004, in STB Finance Docket No. 34481, *Horsehead Corp.—Petition for Acquisition and Operation Exemption—Chestnut Ridge Railway Company*, the Board granted Horsehead's request for an exemption authorizing its acquisition and operation of the subject rail line and made the exemption retroactive back to December 23, 2003, when Horsehead acquired the line through a bankruptcy auction.

¹NCR has indicated that the portions of the abandoned right-of-way it proposes to acquire and operate in (b) and (c) above have reverted back to the original owners. Therefore, NCR does not need Board authority to acquire those portions of the right-of-way; however, it does need Board authority to operate those portions of the line.