

U.S.-certified introduction of the CLS class in 2006, the petitioner acknowledged that it could not base its petition on the substantial similarity of the 2005 Mercedes-Benz 350 CLS to the U.S.-certified 2006 Mercedes-Benz CLS class due to the model year discrepancy and the petitioning requirements of 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A), as set forth in 49 CFR part 593. Instead, the petitioner chose to establish import eligibility on the basis that the vehicles have safety features that comply with, or are capable of being modified to comply with, the FMVSS based on destructive test data or such other evidence that NHTSA decides to be adequate as set forth in 49 U.S.C Part 30141(a)(1)(B). The petitioner contends that the 2005 Mercedes-Benz 350 CLS utilizes the same components as the U.S.-certified 2006 Mercedes-Benz 350 CLS in virtually all of the systems subject to the applicable FMVSS.

G&K submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 2005 Mercedes-Benz 350 CLS passenger cars conform to many FMVSS and are capable of being altered to comply with all other standards to which they were not originally manufactured to conform.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that non-U.S. certified 2005 Mercedes-Benz 350 CLS passenger cars, as originally manufactured, conform to: 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*, 118 *Power-Operated Window, Partition, and Roof Panel Systems*, 124 *Accelerator Control Systems*, 135 *Light Vehicle Brake Standard*, 201 *Occupant Protection in Interior Impact*, 202 *Head Restraints*, 204 *Steering Control Rearward Displacement*, 205 *Glazing Materials*, 207 *Seating Systems*, 209 *Seat Belt Assemblies* 210, *Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages*, 212 *Windshield Mounting*, 214 *Side Impact Protection*, 216 *Roof Crush Resistance*, 219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion*, and 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials*.

The petitioner also contends that the vehicles are capable of being altered to meet the following standards, in the manner indicated:

Standard No. 101 *Controls and Displays*: Installation of U.S.-model instrument cluster and U.S.-version software.

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment*: Installation of U.S.-model: (a)

Headlamps; and (b) front side marker lamps with reflex reflectors.

Standard No. 110 *Tire Selection and Rims and Motor Home/Recreational Vehicle Trailer Load Carrying Capacity Information for Motor Vehicles with a GVWR of 4,536 Kilograms (10,000 pounds) or Less*: Installation of a tire and rim 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, or a supplemental key warning system to meet the requirements of this standard.

Standard No. 206 *Door Locks and Door Retention Components*: Inspection of all vehicles and installation of a conforming door lock and door retention components on vehicles not already so equipped.

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

Standard No. 225 *Child Restraint Anchorage Systems*: Installation of U.S.-model child restraint anchorage system components that meet the requirements of FMVSS No. 225.

Standard No. 301 *Fuel System Integrity*: Inspection of all vehicles and installation of U.S.-conforming components on vehicles not already so equipped to ensure that the fuel system meets the requirements of this standard.

Standard No. 401 *Interior Trunk Release*: Installation of U.S.-model interior trunk release components to ensure that the vehicle meets the requirements of this standard.

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 addresses 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: May 6, 2011.

Claude H. Harris,

Acting Associate Administrator for Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 2011-11993 Filed 5-16-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2011-0054; Notice 1]

Cooper Tire & Rubber Tire Company, Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Cooper Tire & Rubber Tire Company, (Cooper),¹ has determined that approximately 6,964 passenger car replacement tires manufactured between January 23, 2011 and March 26, 2011, do not fully comply with paragraph S5.5(f) of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 139, *New Pneumatic Radial Tires for Light Vehicles*. Cooper has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports* (dated March 31, 2011).

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) (see implementing rule at 49 CFR part 556), Cooper has petitioned for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

This notice of receipt of Cooper's petition 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 petition.

Affected are approximately 6,964 size LT285/75R16 Cooper brand Discoverer S/T MAXX model passenger car replacement tires manufactured between January 23, 2011 and March 26, 2011, at Cooper's plant located in Texarkana, Arkansas.

NHTSA notes that the statutory provisions (49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h)) that permit manufacturers to file petitions for a determination of inconsequentiality allow NHTSA to exempt manufacturers only from the duties found in sections 30118 and 30120, respectively, to notify owners, purchasers, and dealers of a defect or noncompliance and to remedy the defect or noncompliance. Therefore, these provisions only apply to the 6,964² tires that Cooper no longer

¹ Cooper Tire & Rubber Tire Company (Cooper) is a replacement equipment manufacturer incorporated in the state of Delaware.

² Cooper's petition, which was filed under 49 CFR Part 556, requests an agency decision to exempt Cooper as a replacement equipment manufacturer from the notification and recall responsibilities of 49 CFR part 573 for 6,964 of the affected tires. However, the agency cannot relieve tire distributors and dealers of the prohibitions on the sale, offer for sale, introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of the noncompliant tires

controlled at the time that it determined that a noncompliance existed in the subject tires.

Paragraph S5.5(f) of FMVSS No. 139 require in pertinent part:

S5.5 Tire markings. Except as specified in paragraphs (a) through (i) of S5.5, each tire must be marked on each sidewall with the information specified in S5.5(a) through (d) and on one sidewall with the information specified in S5.5(e) through (i) according to the phase-in schedule specified in S7 of this standard. The markings must be placed between the maximum section width and the bead on at least one sidewall, unless the maximum section width of the tire is located in an area that is not more than one-fourth of the distance from the bead to the shoulder of the tire. If the maximum section width falls within that area, those markings must appear between the bead and a point one-half the distance from the bead to the shoulder of the tire, on at least one sidewall. The markings must be in letters and numerals not less than 0.078 inches high and raised above or sunk below the tire surface not less than 0.015 inches * * *

(f) The actual number of plies in the sidewall, and the actual number of plies in the tread area, if different * * *

Cooper explains that the noncompliance is that, due to a mold labeling error, the sidewall marking on the reference side of the tires incorrectly describes the actual number of plies in the tread area of the tires as required by paragraph S5.5(f). Specifically, the tires in question were inadvertently manufactured with "TREAD 1 PLY NYLON + 2 PLY STEEL + 3 PLY POLYESTER; SIDEWALL 3 PLY POLYESTER." The labeling should have been "TREAD 2 PLY NYLON + 2 PLY STEEL + 3 PLY POLYESTER; SIDEWALL 3 PLY POLYESTER."

Cooper also explains that while the non-compliant tires are mislabeled, the tires do in fact have 2 Nylon tread plies and meet or exceed all other applicable Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards.

Cooper reported that this noncompliance was discovered during a review of the specified stamping requirements and visual inspection of tire stamping.

Cooper argues that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety because the noncompliant sidewall marking does not create an unsafe condition and all other labeling requirements have been met.

Cooper points out that NHTSA has previously granted similar petitions for non-compliances in sidewall marking.

In summation, Cooper believes that the described noncompliance of its tires

under their control after Cooper notified them that the subject noncompliance existed. Those tires must be brought into conformance, exported, or destroyed.

to meet the requirements of FMVSS No. 139 is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that its petition, to exempt from providing recall notification of noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30118 and remedying the recall noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30120 should be granted.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on this petition. Comments must refer to the docket and notice number cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted by any of the following methods:

a. By mail addressed to: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590.

b. By hand delivery to U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. except Federal Holidays.

c. Electronically: by logging onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Web site at <http://www.regulations.gov/>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Comments may also be faxed to 1-202-493-2251.

Comments must be written in the English language, and be no greater than 15 pages in length, although there is no limit to the length of necessary attachments to the comments. If comments are submitted in hard copy form, please ensure that two copies are provided. If you wish to receive confirmation that your comments were received, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard with the comments. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided.

Documents submitted to a docket may be viewed by anyone at the address and times given above. The documents may also be viewed on the Internet at http://www.regulations.gov by following the online instructions for accessing the dockets. DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement is available for review in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000, (65 FR 19477-78).

The petition, supporting materials, and all comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated below will be filed and will be considered. All comments and supporting materials received after the closing date will also be filed and will be considered to the extent possible.

When the petition is granted or denied, notice of the decision will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

Comment closing date: June 16, 2011.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; Delegations of authority at CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on: May 11, 2011.

Claude H. Harris,

Acting Associate Administrator for Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 2011-11991 Filed 5-16-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of Foreign Assets Control

Identification of Three Entities as Government of Libya Entities Pursuant to Executive Order 13566

AGENCY: Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control ("OFAC") is publishing the names of three entities identified on May 5, 2011 as persons whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to Section 2 of Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011, "Blocking Property and Prohibiting Certain Transactions Related to Libya."

DATES: The identification by the Director of OFAC of the three entities identified in this notice, pursuant to Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011, is effective May 5, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Assistant Director, Compliance Outreach & Implementation, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC 20220, *Tel.*: 202/622-2490.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic and Facsimile Availability

This document and additional information concerning OFAC are available from OFAC's Web site (<http://www.treas.gov/ofac>) or via facsimile through a 24-hour fax-on-demand service, *Tel.*: 202/622-0077.

Background

On February 25, 2011, the President issued Executive Order 13566, "Blocking Property and Prohibiting Certain Transactions Related to Libya" (the "Order") pursuant to, *inter alia*, the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701-06).

Section 2 of the Order blocks all property and interests in property that