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: November 4, 1997.

Marilynne Jacobs,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 97–29603 Filed 11–7–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–97–3067; Notice 1]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1992–1994 Kawasaki EL250 Motorcycles Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1992–1994 Kawasaki EL250 motorcycles are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This document announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that 1992–1994 Kawasaki EL250 motorcycles 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 December 10, 1997.

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 10 am to 5 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), 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**.

Champagne Imports, Inc. of Lansdale, Pennsylvania (''Champagne'') (Registered Importer 90–009) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1992–1994 Kawasaki EL250 motorcycles are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles which Champagne believes are substantially similar are 1992–1994 Kawasaki EX–250 motorcycles 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 1992–1994 Kawasaki EL250 motorcycles to 1992–1994 Kawasaki EX–250 motorcycles, and found the vehicles to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Champagne submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 1992–1994 Kawasaki EL250 motorcycles, as originally manufactured, conform to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as 1992–1994 Kawasaki EX–250 motorcycles, or are capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that 1992–1994 Kawasaki EL250 motorcycles are identical to 1992–1994 Kawasaki EX–250 motorcycles with respect to compliance with Standard Nos. 106 *Brake Hoses,* 111 *Rearview Mirrors,* 116 *Brake Fluid,* 119 *New Pneumatic Tires for Vehicles other than Passenger Cars,* and 122 *Motorcycle Brake Systems.*

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

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment:* installation of U.S.-model headlamp assemblies.

Standard No. 120 *Tire Selection and Rims for Vehicles other than Passenger Cars:* installation of a tire information placard.

Standard No. 123 *Motorcycle Controls and Displays:* installation of a U.S. model speedometer calibrated in miles per hour.

The petitioner also states that vehicle identification number plates meeting the requirements of 49 CFR Part 565 will be affixed to 1992–1994 Kawasaki EL250 motorcycles.

Comments should refer to the docket number and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, DC 20590. 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: November 4, 1997.

Marilynne Jacobs,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 97–29604 Filed 11–7–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–97–3021; Notice 2]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1994–1997 BMW R1100 Motorcycles Are Eligible for Importation; Correction

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

ACTION: Correction to notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1994–1997 BMW R1100 motorcycles are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This document corrects a notice published Wednesday, October 22, 1997 (62 FR 54896) announcing receipt by NHTSA of a petition for a

decision that 1994–1997 BMW R1100 motorcycles that were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are eligible for importation into the United States. The notice incorrectly identified the docket number for this petition as ''Docket No. NHTSA 3021.'' The docket number should have been properly identified as ''Docket No. NHTSA–97–3021.'' Those intending to comment on the petition should ensure that they reference the correct docket number in their comments.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(B) and (b)(1); 49 CFR 593.8; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on November 5, 1997.

Marilynne Jacobs,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 97–29605 Filed 11–7–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Docket No. MC–F–20912]

Peter Pan Bus Lines, Inc.—Pooling—Greyhound Lines, Inc.

AGENCY: Surface Transportation Board, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed pooling application.

SUMMARY: Applicants, Peter Pan Bus Lines, Inc., of Springfield, MA, and Greyhound Lines, Inc., of Dallas, TX, jointly seek approval under 49 U.S.C. 14302 of an operations and revenue pooling agreement to govern their motor passenger and express transportation service between Boston, MA, and New York, NY, and between Springfield, MA, and New York, NY.

DATES: Comments are due by, December 10, 1997 and, if comments are filed, applicants' rebuttal statement is due by December 30, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Send an original and 10 copies of any comments referring to STB Docket No. MC-F–20912 to: Surface Transportation Board, Office of the Secretary, Case Control Unit, 1925 K Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20423–0001. Also, send one copy of comments to each of applicants' representatives: (1) Jeremy Kahn, Suite 810, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20036; (2) Fritz R. Kahn, Suite 750 West, 1100 New York Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20005–3934.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph H. Dettmar, (202) 565–1600. [TDD for the hearing impaired: (202) 565–1695.]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Applicants are competitors on certain intercity routes between Boston, MA, and New York, NY, and between Springfield, MA, and New York, NY. They seek to pool portions of their passenger and express services over routes which they both operate, and to share the revenues derived from their operations over these routes.[1] Applicants state that their services between these points overlap and that excess schedules are operated because of the need to protect their respective market shares. According to applicants, this has resulted in unacceptably low load factors, an over-served market, and inefficient operations.

Applicants submit that the pooling agreement will allow them to reduce excess bus capacity, cement their business relationship, and allow them to share in the financial vicissitudes of the pooled-route operations. They claim public benefits that will include: (1) Rationalization of schedules, eliminating some duplicative departures ''on the hour'' while adding some departures on the half-hour during the busiest times of the day, resulting in more frequent bus service over a broader time period; (2) more coordinated use of terminals and ticketing agents, resulting in greater flexibility for passengers to use buses, tickets, and terminals; (3) capital improvements; and (4) continued bus service by more sound and financially stable carriers. In addition, they assert that approval of the pooling agreement will not significantly affect either the quality of the human environment or the conservation of energy resources. In fact, they claim that the reduction in the number of schedules each carrier operates will result in a salutary effect on the environment.

Applicants state that competition will not be unreasonably restrained. They argue that: (1) The pooled service is subject to substantial intermodal competitive pressure from Amtrak, airlines, and private automobiles; and (2) other motor passenger carriers may easily enter and compete in the market.

Copies of the application may be obtained free of charge by contacting applicants' representatives. A copy of this notice will be served on the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 10th Street & Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20530.

Decided: October 30, 1997.

By the Board, Chairman Morgan and Vice Chairman Owen.

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–29613 Filed 11–7–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915–00–P

[1] Applicants have already received authority to pool their operations and revenues for their motor passenger and express transportation service between Philadelphia, PA, and New York City in *Peter Pan Bus Lines, Inc.—Pooling—Greyhound Lines, Inc.*, STB Docket No. MC–F–20904 (STB served June 30, 1997). A similar request involving operations between New York City and Washington, DC is pending in *Peter Pan Bus Lines, Inc.—Pooling—Greyhound Lines, Inc.*, STB Docket No. MC–F–20908. According to applicants, the instant application is a logical extension of the New York-Philadelphia pooling and the New York-Washington pooling. Applicants state that they intend to file a fourth such application involving operations between Albany, NY, and Boston, MA shortly. Applicants state that they consider the four agreements to be interrelated and intend to implement them simultaneously after approval by the Board. We note that the United States Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, has filed comments in STB Docket No. MC–F–20908, recommending that the Board find that there is a substantial likelihood that the proposed pooling of operations between New York City and Washington would unduly restrain competition.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Treasury, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). Currently, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms within the Department of the Treasury is soliciting comments concerning the Application For Amended Basic Permit Under the Federal Alcohol Administration Act.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before January 9, 1998 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Linda Barnes, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, 650 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20226, (202) 927–8930.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the form(s) and instructions should be directed to Marsha Baker, Regulations Branch. 650 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20226, (202) 927–8476.