

there have been no incidents of vandalism regarding glazing.

C&S Railroad Corporation (CSKR)
(Waiver Petition Docket Number RSGM-95-7)

The C&S Railroad Corporation (CSKR) seeks a permanent waiver of compliance with certain provisions of the Safety Glazing Standards (Title 49 CFR Part 223) for one locomotive. The locomotive, STRT 11, an EMD 900 HP switcher built in 1937, is currently covered by waiver Docket Number RSGM-88-19 on the Stewartstown Railroad. The locomotive will be transferred to operate on CSKR. The CSKR operates on approximately 18 miles of track between Packerton Junction, Jim Thorpe and Haucks, Pennsylvania. Maximum track speed is 15 mph through the mostly rural area. The locomotive will be used approximately once per week.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on May 25, 1995.

Phil Olekszyk,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Compliance and Program Implementation.

[FR Doc. 95-13427 Filed 5-31-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-6-P

Notice of Application for Approval of Discontinuance or Modification of a Railroad Signal System or Relief from the Requirements of Title 49 CFR Part 236

Pursuant to Title 49 CFR Part 235 and 49 U.S.C. App. 26, the following railroads have petitioned the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) seeking approval for the discontinuance or modification of the signal system or relief from the requirements of Title 49 CFR Part 236 as detailed below.

Block Signal Application (BS-AP)-No. 3354

Applicants: CSX Transportation, Incorporated, Mr. D.G. Orr, Chief Engineer—Train Control, 500 Water Street (S/C J-350), Jacksonville, Florida 32202; Norfolk Southern Corporation, Mr. J.W. Smith, Chief Engineer—C&S Communication and Signal Department, 99 Spring Street, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303.

CSX Transportation, Incorporated (CSX) and Norfolk Southern Corporation (NS) jointly seek approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of the automatic interlocking at 29th Street, milepost 737.0, Birmingham, Alabama, CSX Mobile Division, Boyles Subdivision, where the single CSX main track crosses at grade the single NS yard track. The proposed

changes consist of the discontinuance and removal of four interlocking signals, installation of a swing gate normally lined for CSX movements, and government of train operations by Yard Limit Rules.

The reasons given for the proposed changes is to eliminate facilities no longer needed for present day operation.

BS-AP-No. 3355

Applicants: Consolidated Rail Corporation, Mr. J.F. Noffsinger, Chief Engineer—C&S, 2001 Market Street, P.O. Box 41410, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101-1410; Norfolk Southern Corporation, Mr. J.W. Smith, Chief Engineer—C&S, Communication and Signal Department, 99 Spring Street, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303; Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad Company, Mr. C.H. Allen, General Manager, 2721-161st Street, P. O. Box 389, Hammond, Indiana 46325; Northern Indiana Commuter Transportation District, Mr. Victor R. Babin, General Manager, 601 North Roeske Avenue, Michigan City, Indiana 46360-2669.

Consolidated Rail Corporation (Conrail), Norfolk Southern Railway Company (NS), Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad Company (IHB), and Northern Indiana Commuter Transportation District (NICD) jointly seek approval of the proposed modifications to the signal system, on Conrail's S.C. & S Branch, Dearborn Division, between "Hegewisch" Interlocking, milepost 3.9 and "Calumet Park", milepost 5.5, South Chicago, Illinois, consisting of the following:

1. The discontinuance and removal of the traffic control system on the single main track between "Hegewisch" Interlocking and "Calumet Park", and operate as an Industrial Track;
2. The discontinuance and removal of "Hegewisch" Interlocking, milepost 3.9;
3. The conversion of Conrail's 2N and 2S signals at "Burnham" Interlocking, milepost 4.6, from operator controlled to automatic operation;
4. The conversion of NICD's 4E, 4W, 6E, and 6W signals at "Burnham" Interlocking, milepost 4.6, from operator controlled to automatic operation; and
5. The relocation of control to the NS Bridge Operator of the remaining NS signals and switches at "Burnham" Interlocking, milepost 4.6.

The reason given for the proposed changes is to retire facilities no longer required for present operation.

BS-AP-No. 3356

Applicants: Norfolk Southern Corporation, Mr. J.W. Smith, Chief Engineer—C&S, Communication and Signal Department, 99 Spring Street,

S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303; CSX Transportation, Incorporated, Mr. D.G. Orr, Chief Engineer—Train Control, 500 Water Street (S/C J-350), Jacksonville, Florida 32202.

The Norfolk Southern Corporation (NS) and CSX Transportation, Incorporated (CSX) jointly seek approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of the automatic interlocking at South Lima Yard, Ohio, milepost SP91.5, on the NS Lake Division, Frankfort District, where a single CSX yard track intersects with two NS yard tracks and one NS main track, through a series of hand-throw crossover switches. The proposed changes consist of the discontinuance and removal of all associated signals and government of train operations by Yard Limit Rules.

The reasons given for the proposed changes is to eliminate facilities no longer needed for present day operation.

Rules Standards & Instructions Application (RS&I-AP) No. 1095

Applicant: Consolidated Rail Corporation, Mr. J.F. Noffsinger, Chief Engineer—C&S, 2001 Market Street, P.O. Box 41410, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101-1410.

Consolidated Rail Corporation (Conrail) seeks relief from the requirements of the Rules, Standard and Instructions, 49 CFR, Part 236, § 236.566, to the extent that Conrail be permitted to operate non-equipped Norfolk Southern locomotives, with or without cars, not exceeding 20 mph, on Track No. 1 and Track No. 2, between milepost 131.3, "Landover" Interlocking and milepost 136.7, "CP Virginia" Interlocking, near Washington, D.C., on the Landover Line, Harrisburg Division.

The applicant's justification for relief is to seek similar easement for the NS on this line, predicated upon existing relief for Conrail work trains and trains operating in switching service, as well as CSX trains, between "CP Anacostia" and "CP Virginia."

Any interested party desiring to protest the granting of an application shall set forth specifically the grounds upon which the protest is made, and contain a concise statement of the interest of the protestant in the proceeding. The original and two copies of the protest shall be filed with the Associate Administrator for Safety, FRA, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590 within 45 calendar days of the date of issuance of this notice. Additionally, one copy of the protest shall be furnished to the applicant at the address listed above.

FRA expects to be able to determine these matters without oral hearing.

However, if a specific request for an oral hearing is accompanied by a showing that the party is unable to adequately present his or her position by written statements, an application may be set for public hearing.

Issued in Washington, DC on May 25, 1995.

Phil Olekszyk,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Compliance and Program Implementation.

[FR Doc. 95-13428 Filed 5-31-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-06-P

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 95-46; Notice 1]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Determination that Nonconforming 1972 through 1976 Bristol VRT Buses Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Request for comments on petition for determination that nonconforming 1972 through 1976 Bristol VRT buses are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This notice requests comments on a petition submitted to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) for a determination that 1972 through 1976 Bristol VRT buses that were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are eligible for importation into the United States because they have safety features that comply with, or are capable of being modified to comply with, all such standards.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the petition is July 3, 1995.

ADDRESS: Comments should refer to the docket number and notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Section, Room 5109, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh St., SW, Washington, DC 20590. [Docket hours are from 9:30 am to 4 pm.]

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: George Entwistle, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202) 366-5306.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A) (formerly section 108(c)(3)(A)(i)(I) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act (the Act)), 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 (formerly section 114 of the Act), 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. Where there is no substantially similar U.S.-certified motor vehicle, 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(B) (formerly section 108(c)(3)(A)(i)(II) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. 1397(c)(3)(A)(i)(II)) permits a nonconforming motor vehicle to be admitted into the United States if its safety features comply with, or are capable of being altered to comply with, all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards based on destructive test data or such other evidence as NHTSA decides to be adequate.

Petitions for eligibility determinations 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 determines, 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 determination in the **Federal Register**.

Double Decker bus Company of Denver, Colorado (Registered Importer No. R-93-015) has petitioned NHTSA to determine whether 1972 through 1976 Bristol VRT buses are eligible for importation into the United States. The petitioner contends that these vehicles are eligible for importation under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(B) because they have safety features that comply with, or are capable of being modified to comply with, all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that 1972 through 1976 Bristol VRT buses have safety features that comply with Standard Nos. 102 Transmission Shift Lever Sequence . . . (based on documentation illustrating transmission braking effect, schematic diagram indicating starter interlock protection, and photograph showing shift lever positions), 103 Defrosting and Defogging Systems (based on statement and photograph indicating that system incorporates electrically heated elements and coolant heated air

blowers), 104 Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems (based on statement and photographs indicating that system is pneumatically driven and offers full coverage of windshield at two set speeds and intermittently), 107 Reflecting Surfaces (based on statement and photographs indicating that reflective glare is kept to a minimum in the driver's cab through the use of matt black paint on the windshield wipers, the rearview mirror frame, the dash, and the cab walls), 120 Tire Selection and Rims for Motor Vehicles other than Passenger Cars (based on statements and photographs showing certification markings on tires and rims, and describing contents of tire information placard), 121 Air Brake Systems (based on statement, photographs, and specifications indicating that vehicles are equipped with an air compressors and associated equipment that provides greater cut-in pressure than 85 p.s.i.), 124 Accelerator Control systems (based on statement and photographs indicating that throttle return is provided by pneumatic valve, supplemented by a spring loaded foot pedal and photographs showing pneumatic accelerator resetting is less than one second), 205 Glazing Materials (based on statement and photographs showing that glazing materials bear DOT certification markings), 207 Seating Systems, (based on statement and photographs indicating that ample room exists for passengers to move in and out of their seats and that seats are securely mounted to vehicle floor) 217 Bus Window Retention and Release (based on statement describing window retention test procedures and results, and calculations indicating size and distribution of emergency exits), and 302 Flammability of Interior Materials (based on photographs and statements indicating composition of upholstery, and describing test procedures and results).

The petitioner also contends that 1972 through 1976 Bristol VRT buses are capable of being modified to comply with the following standards, in the manner indicated:

Standard No. 101 Controls and Displays: (a) Installation of a potentiometer wired in series to provide variation in panel lighting; (b) installation of dash-mounted high beam telltale; (c) installation of U.S.-model license plate lamp.

Standard No. 106 Brake Hoses: replacement of flexible brake hoses on front wheels with U.S.-model parts.

Standard No. 108 Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment: installation of the following equipment bearing DOT certification markings: (a)