

enables them to select the proper repair materials or procedures for retreading or repairing the tires. A steel cord radial tire can experience a circumferential or "zipper" rupture in the upper sidewall when it is operated underinflated or overloaded. If information regarding the number of plies and cord material is removed from the sidewall, technicians cannot determine if the tire has a steel cord sidewall ply. As a result, many light truck tires will be inflated outside a restraining device or safety cage where they represent a substantial threat to the technician. This information is critical when determining if the tire is a candidate for a zipper rupture. In this case, since the steel cord construction is properly identified on the sidewall, the technician will have sufficient notice.

In addition, the agency conducted a series of focus groups, as required by the TREAD Act, to examine consumer perceptions and understanding of tire labeling. Few of the focus group participants had knowledge of tire labeling beyond the tire brand name, tire size, and tire pressure.

The agency believes that the true measure of inconsequentiality to motor vehicle safety, in this case, is the effect of the noncompliance on the operational safety of vehicles on which these tires are mounted. Since the tires had more tread plies than indicated on the sidewall, the labeling noncompliance has no effect on the performance of the subject tires. A tire with more tread plies is likely to be a more robust tire even though it has no additional load-carrying capacity.

In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that the applicant has met its burden of persuasion that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, its application is granted and the applicant is exempted from providing the notification of the noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30118, and from remedying the noncompliance, as required by 49 U.S.C. 30120.

Authority: (49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h); delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8)

Issued on: March 2, 2005.

Stephen R. Kratzke,

Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 05-4435 Filed 3-7-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2005-20489]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 2004 and 2005 Porsche Carrera GT Passenger Cars are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 2004 and 2005 Porsche Carrera GT 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 and 2005 Porsche Carrera GT 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 April 7, 2005.

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 and 2005 Porsche Carrera GT passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles which J.K. believes are substantially similar are 2004 and 2005 Porsche Carrera GT 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 and 2005 Porsche Carrera GT 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 and 2005 Porsche Carrera GT 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 and 2005 Porsche Carrera GT 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*, 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*.

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. U.S. version software must also be downloaded to meet the requirements of this standard.

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment*: inspection of all vehicles and installation, on vehicles that are not already so equipped, of U.S.-model headlamps, front side marker lamps, taillamp assemblies that incorporate rear side marker lamps, a high-mounted stoplamp assembly, and front and rear side reflex reflectors.

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 the required warning statement on the face of that mirror.

Standard No. 114 *Theft Protection*: installation of U.S. version software to meet the requirements of this standard.

Standard No. 118 *Power-Operated Window, Partition, and Roof Panel Systems*: installation of U.S. version software, or installation of a supplemental relay system to meet the requirements of the standard.

Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*: installation of U.S. version software to ensure that the seat belt warning system meets the requirements of this standard.

Petitioner states that the vehicle's restraint system components include U.S.-model airbags and knee bolsters, and combination lap and shoulder belts at the outboard front designated seating positions.

Standard No. 209 *Seat Belt Assemblies*: inspection of all vehicles and replacement of any non-U.S.-model

seat belts with U.S.-model components on vehicles that are not already so equipped.

The petitioner also states that all vehicles will be inspected for conformity with the Bumper Standard found in 49 CFR Part 581 and that any non-U.S.-model components necessary for conformity with this standard will be replaced with U.S.-model components.

The petitioner additionally 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.

Claude H. Harris,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.
[FR Doc. 05-4297 Filed 3-7-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 34667]

BNSF Railway Company—Acquisition and Operation—State of South Dakota

AGENCY: Surface Transportation Board.

ACTION: Notice of filing of application and request for public comments.

SUMMARY: BNSF Railway Company (BNSF)¹ has filed an application under 49 U.S.C. 10901 for authority to acquire and operate approximately 368 miles of railroad lines (referred to as the “Core Lines”) that are owned by the State of

South Dakota (the State).² The Core Lines, which are described in a July 10, 1986 Operating Agreement between Burlington Northern Railroad Company (BN, a BNSF predecessor) and the State, extend principally: between milepost (MP) 777.0 near Aberdeen, SD, and MP 650.6 near Mitchell, SD; between MP 518.9 near Sioux City, IA, and MP 649.7 near Mitchell, SD; between MP 293.1 near Canton, SD, and MP 650.6 near Mitchell, SD;³ between MPs 74.1 and 68.8 in Sioux Falls, SD; between MP 68.8 near Sioux Falls, SD, and MP 49.4 near Canton, SD; and between MPs 511.9 and 518.9 in Sioux City, IA.

DATES: Comments respecting the BNSF application must be filed by March 11, 2005. Replies to such comments must be filed by March 25, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Any filing submitted in this proceeding must be submitted either via the Board's e-filing format or in the traditional paper format. Any person using e-filing should comply with the instructions found on the Board's <http://www.stb.dot.gov> Web site, at the “E-FILING” link. Any person submitting a filing in the traditional paper format should send an original and 10 paper copies of the filing (and also an IBM-compatible floppy disk with any textual submission in any version of either Microsoft Word or WordPerfect) to: Surface Transportation Board, 1925 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20423-0001. In addition, one copy of each filing in this proceeding must be sent to each of the following (any such copy may be sent by e-mail or fax, but only if service by e-mail or fax is acceptable to the recipient): Adrian L. Steel, Jr., Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw LLP, 1909 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20006-1101 (phone: (202) 263-3237; fax: (202) 263-5237); and Sarah W. Bailiff, BNSF Railway Company, 2500 Lou Menk Drive, Fort Worth, TX 76131 (phone: (817) 352-2354; fax: (817) 352-2397).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Joseph H. Dettmar, (202) 565-1609. [Assistance for the hearing impaired is available through the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.]

² BNSF previously indicated that the Core Lines consist of approximately 369.7 miles of railroad lines. See *The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company C—Acquisition and Operation Exemption—State of South Dakota*, STB Finance Docket No. 34645 (STB served Jan. 19, 2005). The slight discrepancy (the 368 miles now indicated vs. the 369.7 miles previously indicated) has not been explained.

³ The distance between MP 293.1 near Canton and MP 650.6 near Mitchell is approximately 81.50 miles. See BNSF's application, Exhibit B, Appendix 1 at 6. BNSF has not explained the discrepancy respecting the milepost designations.

¹ Effective January 20, 2005, The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company changed its name to BNSF Railway Company.