

Copies may be provided to the audience at the discretion of the participant.

(7) Statements made by the FAA and JAA are intended to facilitate discussion of issues or to clarify issues. Any statement made during the meeting by an official is not intended to be, and should not be construed as, a position of the FAA or JAA.

(8) The meeting is designed to solicit public views and more complete information on proposed harmonization initiatives. Therefore, the meeting will be conducted in an informal and nonadversarial manner. No individual will be subject to cross-examination by any other participant; however, panel members may ask questions to clarify a statement and to ensure a complete and accurate record.

Issued in Washington, DC, on October 18, 2000.

Brenda D. Courtney,

Manager, Aircraft and Airport Rules Division.
[FR Doc. 00-27333 Filed 10-24-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

Petition for Waiver of Compliance

In accordance with part 211 of Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), notice is hereby given that the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) received a request for a waiver of compliance from certain requirements of its safety regulations. The individual petition is described below including, the party seeking relief, the regulatory provisions involved, the nature of the relief being requested, and the petitioner's arguments in favour of relief.

Texas Parks and Wildlife

[Docket Number FRA-2000-7270]

Texas Parks and Wildlife (TPW) seeks a permanent waiver of compliance from 49 CFR 232.17(b)(2) to extend the clean, oil, test, and stencil (COT&S) period from 15 to 48 months on passenger cars they operate equipped with UC and L type air brakes. TPW operates the Texas State Railroad between Rusk and Palestine, Texas. They have two cars equipped with L type brakes and the rest have UC type brakes. Section 232.17(b)(2) requires that brake equipment on passenger cars must be clean, repaired, lubricated and tested as often as necessary to maintain it in a safe and suitable condition for service but not less frequently than as required in Standard S-045 in the Manual of Standards and Recommended Practices of the Association of American

Railroads. Standard S-045, A-III-256, Section 2.1.2, requires a COT&S every 15 months for this brake equipment. TPW has concluded that a car that runs on a passenger railroad using a 15 month cycle would be legal for 10,800 hours. TPW has calculated that if the equipment is in service only 60 percent of the 15 month cycle, then only 6,480 hours would be used. TPW claims that all of their annual runs, including specials and school runs, only total 1,100 hours a year. Therefore, TPW would like to extend the COT&S time period to 48 months, which would be less than 4,400 hours of actual service time.

Interested parties are invited to participate in these proceedings by submitting written views, data, or comments. FRA does not anticipate scheduling a public hearing in connection with these proceedings since the facts do not appear to warrant a hearing. If any interested party desires an opportunity for oral comment, they should notify FRA in writing, before the end of the comment period and specify the basis for their request.

All communications concerning these proceedings should identify the appropriate docket number (e.g., Waiver Petition Docket Number FRA-2000-7270) and must be submitted in triplicate to the Docket Clerk, DOT Central Docket Management Facility, Room PL-401, Washington, DC. 20590-0001. Communications received within 45 days of the date of this notice will be considered by FRA before final action is taken. Comments received after that date will be considered as far as practicable. All written communications concerning these proceedings are available for examination during regular business hours (9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.) at DOT Central Docket Management Facility, Room PL-401 (Plaza Level), 400 Seventh Street S.W., Washington, DC. All documents in the public docket are also available for inspection and copying on the Internet at the docket facility's Web site at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

Issued in Washington, DC, on October 18, 2000.

Grady C. Cothen, Jr.,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Standards and Program Development.

[FR Doc. 00-27318 Filed 10-24-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

Notice of Application for Approval of Discontinuance or Modification of a Railroad Signal System or Relief From the Requirements of Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations Part 236

Pursuant to Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (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 49 CFR part 236 as detailed below.

Docket No. FRA-2000-7634.

Applicant: Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway, Mr. William G. Peterson, Director Signal Engineering, 4515 Kansas Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66106.

Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway (BNSF) seeks conditional relief from the requirements of Title 49 CFR, part 236, § 236.102(b) of the Rules, Standards, and Instructions, for the entire BNSF system, to the extent that those searchlight signal mechanisms, that have circuitry designed to automatically detect a sticking mechanism and automatically protect for the safety of train movements, not be required to be inspected and the mechanical movement of the mechanism observed operating to all positions, at least once every six months.

Applicants' justification for relief: Stuck mechanism circuits used in Vital Harmon Logic Controllers (VHLC), Wayside Interface Units (WIU), Microprocessor based coded track and control equipment, and relay based stuck mechanism circuits, continuously monitor searchlight mechanisms.

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 Protester in the proceeding. Additionally, one copy of the protest shall be furnished to the applicant at the address listed above.

All communications concerning this proceeding should be identified by the docket number and must be submitted to the Docket Clerk, DOT Central Docket Management Facility, Room PL-401, Washington, DC 20590-0001.

Communications received within 45 days of the date of this notice will be considered by FRA before final action is taken. Comments received after that date will be considered as far as

practicable. All written communications concerning these proceedings are available for examination during regular business hours (9 am–5 pm) at the above address. All documents in the public docket are also available for inspection and copying on the internet at the docket facility's web sit at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

FRA expects to be able to determine these matters without an 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, D.C. on October 18, 2000.

Grady C. Cothen, Jr.,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Standards and Program Development.

[FR Doc. 00–27317 Filed 10–24–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2000–7966]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1996 Plymouth Voyager Multi-Purpose Passenger Vehicles Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1996 Plymouth Voyager multi-purpose passenger vehicles (MPVs) are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This notice announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that a 1996 Plymouth Voyager manufactured for the European and other foreign markets that was not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards is eligible for importation into the United States because: (1) It is substantially similar to a vehicle that was originally manufactured for sale in the United States and that was certified by its manufacturer as complying with the safety standards, and (2) it is capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the petition is November 24, 2000.

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 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**.

Wallace Environmental Testing Laboratories, Inc., of Houston, Texas (“Wallace”) (Registered Importer 90–005) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1996 Plymouth Voyager MPVs manufactured for the European and other foreign markets are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicle which Wallace believes is substantially similar is the 1996 Plymouth Voyager that was manufactured for sale in the United States and certified by its manufacturer, Chrysler Corporation, as conforming to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared the non-U.S. certified 1996 Plymouth Voyager to its U.S. certified counterpart, and found the two vehicles to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Wallace submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that the non-U.S. certified 1996 Plymouth Voyager, as originally manufactured, conforms to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as its U.S. certified counterpart, or is capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that the non-U.S. certified 1996 Plymouth Voyager is identical to its U.S. certified counterpart with respect to compliance with Standard Nos. 102 *Transmission Shift Lever Sequence*, * * *, 103 *Defrosting and Defogging Systems*, 104 *Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems*, 105 *Hydraulic Brake Systems*, 106 *Brake Hoses*, 113 *Hood Latch Systems*, 114 *Theft Protection*, 116 *Brake Fluid*, 118 *Power-Operated Window Systems*, 119 *New Pneumatic Tires*, 124 *Accelerator Control 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*, 209 *Seat Belt Assemblies*, 210 *Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages*, 212 *Windshield Retention*, 214 *Side Impact Protection*, 216 *Roof Crush Resistance*, 219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion*, and 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials*.

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

Standard No. 101 *Controls and Displays*: Replacement of the speedometer/odometer with a unit calibrated in miles per hour.

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment*: Replacement of the headlight and taillight assemblies with components that conform to the standard.

Standard No. 111 *Rearview Mirrors*: Inscription of the required warning statement on the passenger side rearview mirror.

Standard No. 120 *Tire Selection and Rims*: Installation of a tire information placard.

Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*: (a) Replacement of the driver's seat belt latch and installation of a seat belt warning buzzer system that conforms to the standard; (b) replacement of the driver's and passenger's side air bag systems and knee bolsters with U.S.-model components on vehicles that are not already so equipped. The petitioner states that the vehicle is equipped with Type 2 seat belts in all front, center and rear designated seating positions, and