

replacement of the driver's and passenger's air bags and knee bolsters, and all seat belts with U.S.-model components on vehicles that are not already so equipped. Petitioner states that the vehicles should be equipped in the front and rear outboard seating positions with combination lap and shoulder belts that are self-tensioning and that release by means of a single red pushbutton.

Standard No. 209 *Seat Belt Assemblies*: Inspection of all vehicles and replacement of any noncompliant seat belts with U.S.-model components.

Standard No. 210 *Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages*: Inspection of all vehicles and replacement of any noncompliant seat belt anchorages with U.S.-model components.

Standard No. 301 *Fuel System Integrity*: Replacement of all non-U.S. model fuel system components with U.S.-model components.

Standard No. 401 *Interior Trunk Release*: Installation of a U.S.-model switch that will enable the trunk lid to be released from inside the trunk.

The petitioner states that all vehicles must be inspected to ensure that they are equipped with an anti-theft device that meets the requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard found in 49 CFR part 541, and that such devices will be installed in any vehicles that are not already so equipped.

The petitioner also states that a vehicle identification number plate must be affixed to the vehicles near the left windshield post and a reference and certification label must be affixed in the area of the left front door post to meet the requirements of 49 CFR part 565. In addition, the petitioner states that a certification label must be affixed to the driver's doorjamb to meet the requirements of 49 CFR part 567.

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: January 12, 2004.

**Kenneth N. Weinstein,**  
*Associate Administrator for Enforcement.*  
[FR Doc. 04-925 Filed 1-14-04; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2003-16612]

#### Extension of Comment Period on Whether Nonconforming 2002 Ferrari 360 Spider and Coupe Passenger Cars Manufactured From September 1, 2002 Through December 31, 2002 Are Eligible for Importation

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Extension of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** This document announces the extension of the comment period on a petition for NHTSA to decide that 2002 Ferrari 360 Spider and Coupe passenger cars manufactured from September 1, 2002 through December 31, 2002 that were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are eligible for importation into the United States.

**DATES:** The closing date for comments on the petition is January 26, 2004.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments are to be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street, 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 document (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 19477-787) 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:** On December 11, 2003, NHTSA published a notice (at 68 FR 69125) that it had received a petition to decide that nonconforming 2002 Ferrari 360 Spider and Coupe passenger cars manufactured from September 1, 2002 through December 31, 2002 are eligible for

importation into the United States. The notice solicited public comments on the petition and stated that the closing date for comments is January 12, 2004.

This is to notify the public that NHTSA is extending the comment period until January 26, 2004. This extension is based on a request from Ferrari North America, Inc. (FNA), the U.S. representative of the vehicle's manufacturer, Ferrari, SpA. FNA requested a 30-day extension of the comment period. The company stated that this extension was needed "because a portion of the comment period was lost due to the holidays, and because of the complexity of the technical analysis necessary to evaluate the petition, particularly with regard to [Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard] No. 208 conformance." Standard No. 208 establishes minimum performance requirements for motor vehicle systems that provide occupant crash protection. FNA contended that the requested 30-day extension "will not prejudice the parties or unduly delay the proceeding and will afford FNA and Ferrari SpA personnel the opportunity to fully evaluate the petition in order to determine the appropriate scope and content of FNA's comments."

NHTSA has considered FNA's request, and concluded that the full 30-day extension requested by the company is not warranted in this circumstance. The 30-day comment period provided in the notice of petition should have afforded FNA a sufficient opportunity to evaluate the petition and determine the scope and content of its comments. The agency notes, in this regard, that FNA has already had an opportunity to comment on a previous petition seeking import eligibility for 2002 Ferrari 360 passenger cars manufactured before September 1, 2002. The conformity differences between those vehicles and the ones that are the subject of the instant petition should not be so great as to require a 30-day extension in the comment period. However, the agency is willing to provide some extension of the comment period in light of the fact that employee absences over the holiday period may have interfered with FNA's ability to fully evaluate the petition. NHTSA has consequently decided to extend the comment period for an additional two weeks.

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: January 12, 2004.

**Kenneth N. Weinstein,**

*Associate Administrator for Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. 04-926 Filed 1-14-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-84-U**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Research and Special Programs Administration

[Docket No. RSPA-03-15122; Notice 2]

#### Pipeline Safety: Petition for Waiver; Duke Energy Gas Transmission Company

**AGENCY:** Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to consider waiver.

**SUMMARY:** Duke Energy Gas Transmission Company (DEGT) petitioned the Research and Special Programs Administration's (RSPA) Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS) for a waiver of compliance with provisions of 49 CFR 192.611, which requires pipeline operators to confirm or revise the maximum allowable operating pressure (MAOP) of their pipelines after a class location change. DEGT proposes an alternative set of risk control activities in lieu of a reduction in pressure or pressure testing of selected pipeline segments in Pennsylvania that have changed from Class 1 to Class 2.

**DATES:** Persons interested in submitting written comments on the waiver proposed in this notice must do so by February 17, 2004. Late-filed comments will be considered so far as practicable.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit written comments by mailing or delivering an original and two copies to the Dockets Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001. The Dockets Facility is open from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except on Federal holidays when the facility is closed. Alternatively, you may submit written comments to the docket electronically at the following Web address: <http://dms.dot.gov>.

All written comments should identify the docket and notice numbers stated in the heading of this notice. Anyone who wants confirmation of mailed comments

must include a self-addressed stamped postcard. To file written comments electronically, after logging on to <http://dms.dot.gov>, click on "Comment/Submissions." You can also read comments and other material in the docket at <http://dms.dot.gov>. General information about our pipeline safety program is available at <http://ops.dot.gov>.

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:** James Reynolds by phone at (202) 366-2786, by fax at (202) 366-4566, by mail at U.S. DOT, Research and Special Programs Administration, Office of Pipeline Safety, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590, or by e-mail at [james.reynolds@rspa.dot.gov](mailto:james.reynolds@rspa.dot.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### 1. Background

DEGT petitioned RSPA/OPS for a waiver from compliance with 49 CFR 192.611 for selected gas transmission pipeline segments in Pennsylvania. DEGT is asking for a waiver from the requirement to revise the MAOP or upgrade pipeline segments after a class location change. DEGT asserts that these alternative risk control activities will provide an equal or higher level of safety than that currently provided by the pipeline safety regulations.

The Federal pipeline safety regulations at § 192.609 require a gas pipeline operator to complete a class location change study whenever it believes an increase in population density may have caused a change in class location as defined in § 192.5. If a new class location is confirmed, the operator is required to either reduce pressure or replace the pipe to lower pipe wall stress in compliance with § 192.611.

Section 192.5(a)(1) defines a "class location unit" as an onshore area extending 220 yards (200 meters) on either side of the centerline of any continuous one-mile length of pipeline. The Class Location for any class location unit is determined according to the following criteria in § 192.5(b):

Class 1—10 or fewer buildings intended for human occupancy;

Class 2—more than 10 but less than 46 buildings intended for human occupancy;

Class 3—46 or more buildings intended for human occupancy, or areas where a pipeline lies within 100 yards (91 meters) of either a building or a small, well-defined outside area (such as a playground, recreation area, outdoor theater, or other place of public assembly) that is occupied by 20 or more persons on at least 5 days a week for 10 weeks in any 12-month period;

Class 4—buildings with four or more stories above ground are prevalent (e.g., large office buildings).

The pipeline safety regulations impose more stringent design and operation requirements as the class location increases. When a class location changes to a higher class (e.g., from Class 1 to Class 2) and the hoop stress corresponding to the established MAOP of the segment is not commensurate with the present class location, the MAOP must be confirmed by pressure test or revised using one of the options specified in § 192.611(a). An operator may avoid reducing the pressure, in some cases, if a previous pressure test is adequate to support operation at the existing pressure in the new class location—this is providing that the corresponding hoop stress does not exceed 72 percent Specified Maximum Yield Strength (SMYS) of the pipe in Class 2 locations, 60 percent SMYS in Class 3 locations, or 50 percent SMYS in Class 4 locations. Alternatively, the operator may need to reduce the pressure or replace the pipe with new pipe.

##### 2. DEGT's Proposed Waiver

DEGT's request for a waiver of the requirements of § 192.611 is specific to four pipeline segments on Line 12 and Line 19, which are part of its Texas Eastern Pipeline System in the state of Pennsylvania. These segments are located in the towns of Entriiken, Perulack, Bernville, and Bechtelsville. The pipelines are 24-inch and 30-inch in diameter and the class locations have changed from Class 1 to Class 2. If this waiver is granted, DEGT intends to apply the alternative set of risk reduction strategies to any future sites changing from Class 1 to Class 2 on Lines 12 and Lines 19 of these four compressor station discharges, provided the pipelines satisfy the technical conditions presented in this petition for waiver.

When these pipelines were built between 1954 through 1963, they were hydrotested to at least 100% of the pipe's SMYS with the exception of 10 feet of pipe on the Bechtelsville