inch rim. We have also solicited the input of two major tire manufacturers and specifically inquired as to potential negative effects of such usage. Our analysis, as well as that of the tire manufacturers, is that there is no safety-related issue. Load carrying capacities, air retention, handling characteristics, and other aspects of performance will not be affected to any degree significant to motor vehicle safety. The only potential effect of such usage results from the fact that the tires in question are slightly more spread on the wider 9.00 inch rim resulting in some chance of reduction in tread wear to a minor degree.

It should also be pointed out that the 22.5x9.00 inch size is generally a special application tire and wheel combination typically used in North America only on fleets requiring a particular larger tire for the needs of their operation. The wheel in question is heavier and more expensive than a standard 8.25 inch wheel, and these fleets use the product because of specific higher load requirements and would also use the larger tire to meet those same requirements. It is, therefore, Accuride's conclusion that the possibility that narrower tires would be used on these wheels is extremely remote.

A comment on the petition was received from Robert J. Crail of Knoxville, TN, who concurred with Accuride's argument that the possibility of a tire being misapplied on the noncompliant rims is remote. He recommended granting the petition.

Because Accuride had not specified the names of the tire manufacturers that it had consulted, NHTSA contacted the applicant and learned that the manufacturers were Michelin Tire Corporation and Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc. NHTSA spoke with representatives of the two companies, each of whom stated that the only possible effect of misapplication would be a possible minor increase in tire wear. At NHTSA's request, Accuride is sending an explanatory letter to the entities to whom Accuride sold the noncompliant rims. NHTSA agrees with the argument and comment that the possibility of misapplication is remote due to specialized use by truck fleets.

In consideration of the foregoing, Accuride has met its burden of persuasion that the noncompliance described above is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and it is hereby exempted from providing the notification required by 49 U.S.C. 30118, and the remedy required by 49 U.S.C. 30120.

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

Issued on: February 9, 1995.

Barry Felrice,

Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 95–3693 Filed 2–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

[Docket No. 94–103; Notice 2]

American Transportation Corporation; Grant of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

American Transportation Corporation (AmTran) of Conway, Arkansas determined that some of its vehicles failed to comply with 49 CFR 571.120, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 120, ''Tire Selection and Rims for Vehicles Other Than Passenger Cars,'' and filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, ''Defect and Noncompliance Reports.'' AmTran also applied to be exempted from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301—''Motor Vehicle Safety'' on the basis that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

Notice of receipt of the application was published on November 22, 1994, and an opportunity afforded for comment (59 FR 60190).

Paragraph S5.3 of FMVSS No. 120 requires that each vehicle to which it applies must have a label affixed which includes the size designation of the tires and the size designation of the rims. AmTran produced approximately 38,000 buses and school buses from 1987 through 1994 which do not meet the labeling requirements stated in the standard in that they lack the rim diameter designation on the label. However, the label does bear the complete tire size, which includes the tire diameter.

AmTran supported its application for inconsequential noncompliance with the following:

> The rim width is listed on the certification label; however, the rim diameter is not listed. The complete tire size, including the diameter (which is identical to the rim diameter), is listed on each label. Therefore, [AmTran] believes that sufficient information is available for the user to match tire and rim sizes appropriately.

No comments were received in response to the notice.

Lack of rim size designation could result in installation of replacement tires of an improper size, or installation of a replacement rim that is not congruent with the other (unmarked) rims. Presumably, a tire too small for the rim would not fit and a tire too large for the rim would be noticeable. Further, in determining an appropriate replacement rim, the individual servicing the vehicle would most likely look at the size of the tire on the rim being replaced. NHTSA deems it unlikely that such an individual would simply guess at the correct rim diameter without confirmation from a reliable source. The vehicles whose labels lack the rim size designation are buses and school buses, are typically serviced by experienced individuals, and, as a practical matter, the noncompliance is unlikely to have adverse safety consequences.

In consideration of the foregoing, the applicant has met its burden of persuasion, and the Administrator has decided that the noncompliance herein described is inconsequential to safety. Accordingly, American Transportation Corporation is hereby exempted from providing notification according to 49 U.S.C. 30118, and remedy according to 49 U.S.C. 30120.

(49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 501.8)

Issued on: February 9, 1995.

Barry Felrice,

Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 95–3694 Filed 2–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Fiscal Service

Surety Company Application and Renewal Fees; Increase in Fees Imposed

The Department of the Treasury, Financial Management Service, will be increasing the fees imposed and collected as referred to in 31 CFR 223.22. This increase is to cover the costs incurred by the Government for services performed relative to qualifying corporate sureties to write Federal business.

The new fees are effective December 31, 1994, and are determined in accordance with the Office of Management and Budget Circular A–25, as amended. The increase in fees is the result of a thorough analysis of costs associated with the Surety Bond Branch.

The new rate schedule is as follows:

(1) Examination of a company's application for a Certificate of Authority as an acceptable surety or as an acceptable reinsuring company on Federal bonds—$3,725.

(2) Determination of a company's continued qualification for annual renewal of its Certificate of Authority—$2,200.

(3) Examination of a company's application for recognition as an Admitted Reinsurer (except on excess risks running to the United States)—$1,325.

(4) Determination of a company's continued qualification for annual renewal of its authority as an Admitted Reinsurer—$930.

Questions concerning this notice should be directed to the Surety Bond Branch, Funds Management Division, Financial Management Service, Department of the Treasury, Hyattsville, MD 20782, Telephone (202) 874-6850.

Dated: January 31, 1995.

Diane E. Clark,

Assistant Commissioner, Financial Information, Financial Management Service.

[FR Doc. 95–3791 Filed 2–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–35–M