examines whether the entity existing after a change-in-ownership transaction is the same legal person that existed prior to the transaction and that received subsidies. The EC alleges that this new methodology also is inconsistent with the provisions of the SCM Agreement and the WTO Agreement cited above. According to the EC in its panel request, this methodology ''ignores the consideration paid by the current producer in the privatisation or change of ownership, instead purporting to undertake an analysis of whether the buyer is 'for all intents and purposes' the 'same person' as the company which had received a financial contribution before privatisation.''

The measures identified by the EC (including the relevant Comerce case nuber) are as follows:

- Original Imposition of Countervailing Duties
  - Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from France (C–427–815)
  - Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Quality Steel from France (C–427–817)
  - Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Italy (C–475–825)
  - Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rod from Italy (C–475–821)
  - Stainless Steel Plate in Coils from Italy (C–475–823)
  - Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate from Italy (C–475–827)
- Administrative Reviews
  - Cold-rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Sweden (C–401–401)
  - Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Sweden (C–401–804)
  - Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel from Italy (C–475–812)

(With respect to case C–475–812, the EC panel request refers to a ''Definitive determination in administrative review 2nd request; final sunset results ... .'').

- Sunset Reviews
  - Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plat from the United Kingdom (C–412–815)
  - Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from France (C–427–810)
  - Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Germany (C–428–817)
  - Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Spain (C–469–804)

In addition, the EC also cites section 771(5)(F) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which is entitled ''Change in ownership''. According to the EC in its panel request, section 771(5)(F) is inconsistent with the provisions of the SCM Agreement and the WTO Agreement cited above ''to the extent that it allows [Commerce] to impose countervailing duties without assessing the existence of a countervailable subsidy after a privatisation or change of ownership ... .''

Public Comment: Requirements for Submissions

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning the issues raised in the dispute. Comments must be in English and provided in fifteen copies. A person requesting that information contained in a comment submitted by that person be treated as confidential business information must certify that such information is business confidential and would not customarily be released to the public by the commenter. Confidential business information must be clearly marked **BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL** in a contrasting color ink at the top of each page of each copy.

Information or advice contained in a comment submitted, other than business confidential information, may be determined by USTR to be confidential in accordance with section 135(g)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155 (g)(2)). If the submitter believes that information or advice may qualify as such, the submitter—

(1) Must so designate the information or advice;

(2) Must clearly mark the material as **SUBMITTED IN CONFIDENCE** in a contrasting color ink at the top of each page of each copy; and

(3) Is encouraged to provide a non-confidential summary of the information or advice.

Pursuant to section 127(e) of the URAA (19 U.S.C. 3537 (e)), USTR will maintain a file on this dispute settlement proceeding, accessible to the public, in the USTR Reading Room: Room 101, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20508. The public file will include non-confidential comments received by USTR from the public with respect to the dispute; if a dispute settlement panel is convened, the U.S. submissions to that panel, the submissions, or non-confidential summaries of submissions to the panel received from other participants in the dispute, as well as the report of the panel; and, if applicable, the report of the Appellate Body. An appointment to review the public file (Docket WTO/D–212, Change in Ownership Methodology Dispute) may be made by calling Brenda Webb, (202) 395–6186. The USTR Reading Room is open to the public from 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon and 1 p.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

A. Jane Bradley,

Assistant United States Trade Representative for Monitoring and Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 01–22826 Filed 9–11–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Intent To Rule on Application (01–07–I–00–YKM) To impose a passenger facility charge (PFC) at Yakima Air Terminal-McAllister Field, submitted by the Yakima Air Terminal Board, Yakima Air Terminal-McAllister Field, Yakima, WA

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Intent to Rule on Application.

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose a PFC at Yakima Air Terminal-McAllister Field under the provision of 49 U.S.C. 40117 and part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulation (14 CFR part 158).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before October 12, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: J. Wade Bryant, Manager; Seattle Airports District Office, SEA-ADO; Federal Aviation Administration; 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Suite 250, Renton, Washington, 98055.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Bob Clem, Airport Manager, at the following address: 2400 West Washington Avenue, Yakima, Washington 98903.

Air Carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to Yakima Air Terminal-McAllister Field, under § 158.23 of part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Suzanne Lee-Pang; Seattle Airports District Office, SEA–ADO; Federal Aviation Administration; 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Suite 250, Renton, Washington, 98055. The application may be reviewed in person at this same location.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application 01–07–I–00–YKM to impose a PFC at Yakima Air Terminal-McAllister Field, under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 40117 and part

158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

On September 5, 2001, the FAA determined that the application to impose a PFC, submitted by Yakima Air Terminal Board, Yakima, Washington, was substantially complete within the requirements of § 158.25 of part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than December 8, 2001.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

Level of the proposed PFC: $3.00.

Proposed charge effective date: February 1, 2002.

Proposed charge expiration date: February 1, 2004.

Total requested for impose authority: $456,000.

Brief description of proposed project: Runway 27 Safety Area Improvement, Phase II.

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFC's: air taxi/commercial operators enplaning less than 1% of airport's total enplanements.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** and at the FAA Regional Airports Office located at: Federal Aviation Administration, Northwest Mountain Region, Airports Division, ANM–600, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Suite 315, Renton, WA 98055–4056.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germae to the application in person at the Yakima Air Terminal-McAllister Field.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on September 5, 2001.

David A. Field,

Manager, Planning, Programming and Capacity Branch, Northwest Mountain Region.

[FR Doc. 01–22914 Filed 9–11–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA 2000–8105; Notice 2]

Accuride Corporation; Grant of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Accuride Corporation of Evansville, Indiana, a manufacturer of truck rims and wheels, has determined that approximately 3,700 20 × 7.5 FL side rings produced by Accuride de Mexico (AdM), Accuride's wholly-owned subsidiary, at its Monterrey, Mexico plant, and by Industria Automotriz S.A. de C.V. (IaSa), a Mexican corporation and Accuride's Mexican joint venture partner, fail to comply with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) 120, ''Tire Selection and Rims for Motor Vehicles Other Than Passenger Cars.'' Accuride filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, ''Defect and Noncompliance Reports.'' Accuride has 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, with a 30-day comment period, on March 2, 2001, in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 13126). NHTSA received no comments.

The purpose of FMVSS No. 120, according to S2, is ''to provide safe operational performance by ensuring that vehicles to which it applies are equipped with tires of adequate size and load rating and with rims of appropriate size and type designation.'' Paragraph S5.2 of FMVSS No. 120 requires that each piece, other than the rim base of a multipiece rim, be marked with specific information, including the rim size designation, and a designation that identifies the manufacturer of the rim by name, trademark, or symbol.

Accuride's noncompliance relates to the mis-stamping of the marking on the multipiece rim rings. The stamped rim size designation and type designation on the ring, was transposed as ''R7.5 × 20 FL'' instead of ''20 × 7.5 FL.'' Accuride states, ''All other stampings and markings required by FMVSS 120 and Accuride, including the part number and load rating, are correctly identified on each of the components in question.'' AdM produced a total of approximately 896 rings from January 3, 2000 to February 18, 2000, and approximately 2,804 rings were produced by IaSa and sold by Accuride prior to January 3, 2000. Accuride believes that there is no safety-related issue with respect to this equipment.

These rings, marked with transposed numbers, were sent to original equipment manufacturers and were fitted to Class 8 conventional trucks and trailers. Accuride argues that an individual in a heavy truck repair facility would quickly realize that this marking is incorrect and would be unlikely to attempt to fit this ring on a rim of the size marked. The probability of one of these rings being placed on a rim by an individual believing that the marking is correct is highly unlikely, if not physically impossible, would be attempting to fit a 20-inch diameter ring on to a 7.5-inch diameter base rim.

According to the petitioner, senior Accuride management has extensively reviewed the processes, the causes of these noncompliances have been isolated, and changes in the processes have been instituted to prevent any future occurrences. In addition, the noncompliance is limited to the equipment addressed in this notice, and Accuride stated that its future products would comply with the requirements of FMVSS No. 120.

The agency agrees with Accuride's verbal statements, provided in a telephone conversation, that an individual working in a heavy truck repair shop or tire shop would quickly realize that the size on the ring is mis-labeled by examining the matching rim and mounted tire. Accuride provides the correct size information; however, that information is transposed. These rings and matching rims will be serviced in Class 8 capable facilities with trained heavy truck personnel. The probability of these rings being placed on a rim by a trained individual believing that the marking is correct is remote.

In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that the applicant has met its burden of persuasion that the noncompliance it describes is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, Accuride's application is hereby granted, and the applicant is exempted from the obligation of providing notification of, and a remedy for, the noncompliance.

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

Issued on: September 7, 2001.

Stephen R. Kratzke,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 01–22849 Filed 9–11–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA 2001–9116; Notice 2]

Hankook Tire Corporation; Grant of Application for Decision That Noncompliance Is Inconsequential to Motor Vehicle Safety

Hankook Tire Manufacturing Company, Ltd. (Hankook), a Korean corporation, has determined that approximately 7,600 P205/75R14 Dayton Thorobred tires, produced in the Hankook Daejun Plant during August