

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

Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*: Installation of an audible safety belt warning system. The petitioner states that the vehicle is equipped with Type II seat belts in both front outboard seating positions and Type I seat belts in the rear outboard and center seating positions and that driver and front outboard passenger seating positions are not required to have air bags.

The petitioner also states that a certification label must be affixed to the driver's side door jamb to meet the requirements of 49 CFR part 567.

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on the petition described above. Comments should refer to the docket 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]. 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: April 25, 2002.

Marilynne Jacobs,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.
[FR Doc. 02-10761 Filed 4-30-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2002-11846]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 2001-2002 Mercedes Benz SL (Body 230) Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 2001-2002

Mercedes Benz SL (Body 230) passenger cars are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This document announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that 2001-2002 Mercedes Benz SL (Body 230) passenger cars 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.

DATE: The closing date for comments on the petition is May 31, 2002.

ADDRESS: 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**.

J.K. Technologies, L.L.C. of Baltimore, Maryland ("J.K.") (Registered Importer 90-006) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 2001-2002 Mercedes Benz SL (Body 230) passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles which J.K. believes are substantially similar are 2001-2002 Mercedes Benz SL (Body 230) passenger cars 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 non-U.S. certified 2001-2002 Mercedes Benz SL (Body 230) passenger cars to their U.S.-certified counterparts, and found the vehicles to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

J.K. submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 2001-2002 Mercedes Benz SL (Body 230) passenger cars, as originally manufactured for sale in Europe, conform to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as their U.S. certified counterparts, or are capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that non-U.S. certified 2001-2002 Mercedes Benz SL (Body 230) passenger cars are identical to their U.S. certified counterparts 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*, 109 *New Pneumatic Tires*, 113 *Hood Latch Systems*, 116 *Brake Fluid*, 118 *Power Window Systems*, 124 *Accelerator Control Systems*, 135 *Passenger Car Brake 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*, 216 *Roof Crush Resistance*, 219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion*, 301 *Fuel System Integrity*, and 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials*.

In addition, the petitioner claims that the vehicles comply with the Bumper Standard found in 49 CFR Part 581.

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

Standard No. 101 *Controls and Displays*: replacement of the instrument cluster and cruise control lever with U.S.-model components.

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment*: (a) installation of U.S.-model headlamps and front sidemarker lamps, and (b) installation of U.S.-model taillamp assemblies that incorporate rear sidemarker lamps.

Standard No. 110 *Tire Selection and Rims*: installation of a tire information placard.

Standard No. 111 *Rearview Mirror*: replacement of the passenger side rearview mirror with a U.S.-model component.

Standard No. 114 *Theft Protection*: reprogramming to activate the theft prevention warning system.

Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*: (a) reprogramming to activate the seat belt warning buzzer; (b) inspection of all vehicles and replacement of the driver's and passenger's side air bags, knee bolsters, control units, sensors, and seat belts with U.S.-model components on vehicles that are not already so equipped. Petitioner states that the front outboard designated seating positions have combination lap and shoulder belts that are self-tensioning and that release by means of a single red pushbutton. Petitioner further states that the vehicles are equipped with a seat belt warning lamp that is identical to the lamp installed on U.S.-certified models.

Standard No. 214 *Side Impact Protection*: Inspect vehicles and replace any non-complying part with U.S. model parts. The petitioner states that the vehicles are equipped with side impact air bags identical to those found on U.S.-certified models.

The petitioner also states that a vehicle identification plate must be affixed to the vehicles near the left windshield post and a reference and certification label must be affixed in the area of the left front door post to meet the requirements of 49 CFR part 565.

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on the petition described above. Comments should refer to the docket 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]. 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: April 25, 2002.

Marilynne Jacobs,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 02-10762 Filed 4-30-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2000-7818; Notice 2]

Evenflo Company, Inc., Grant of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Evenflo Company, Inc., of Vandalia, Ohio, has determined that 999,515 child restraint systems that it manufactured fail to comply with S5.4.1(a) of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 213, "Child Restraint Systems," which incorporates S5.1(d) of FMVSS No. 209, "Seat Belt Assemblies," and has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance reports." Evenflo 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 on August 29, 2000, in the **Federal Register** (65 FR 52471), with a 30-day comment period. NHTSA received no comments.

FMVSS No. 213, S5.4.1(a) "Performance Requirements," requires that:

The webbing of belts provided with a child restraint system and used to attach the system to the vehicle or to restrain the child within the system shall, after being subjected to abrasion as specified in S5.1(d) or S5.3(c) of FMVSS No. 209, have a breaking strength of not less than 75 percent of the strength of the unabraded webbing when tested in accordance with S5.1(b) of FMVSS No. 209.

Evenflo has determined that certain child restraints it manufactured may have tether straps which fail the webbing strength requirements of FMVSS No. 213, S5.4.1(a). The child restraints containing the noncompliance are Ultara (model numbers 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, and 239), Secure Comfort (model number 247), Champion (model

number 249), Medallion (model numbers 251, 254 and 259), Horizon (model numbers 420, 421, 425, and 426), Conquest (model numbers 428, and 429) and Tether Kits (model number 628). These child restraints and tether kits were manufactured between January 1, 1998 and May 30, 2000. A total of 959,514 convertible child seats and 40,001 tether kits are in noncompliance with this requirement.

Evenflo supports its application for inconsequential noncompliance with the following:

"In March 2000, Evenflo received a PE [Preliminary Evaluation] from NHTSA relating to a potential noncompliance of tether webbing after being subject to abrasion as specified in S5.1(d) of FMVSS No. 209 (referenced in S5.4.1(a) of FMVSS No. 213). According to NHTSA, based upon testing conducted by NHTSA at SGS U.S. Testing, the Elizabeth Mills black tether webbing (vendor style #7635) retained only 67.1 percent of its unabraded strength. Section S5.4.1(a) of FMVSS No. 213 requires webbing used to attach a child restraint to a vehicle to have a breaking strength after abrasion of not less than 75 percent of the unabraded webbing strength.

In April 2000, Evenflo reviewed testing results from ongoing testing at Elizabeth Webbing Mills that showed all 82 test results acceptable on tests conducted from January 28, 1998 to March 13, 2000. The control chart showed the process to be in statistical control.

Evenflo visited SGS U.S. Testing in Fairfield, New Jersey to review the testing process and obtain samples of the potential nonconforming tether webbing material tested. SGS U.S. Testing did not keep the test samples and had not finished its test report.

Evenflo then tried to obtain samples from our finished good warehouse close to the date code tested by SGS U.S. testing. Exact matches of the date code could not be found. Samples of a close date code were then tested at the following independent test labs: Indiana Mills (IMMI), Magill, ACW, and Elizabeth Webbing Mills. The test results yielded a variety of results from 56 to 88 percent of unabraded strength. A follow up of the test results revealed differences in test set-ups and test equipment.

Concurrently, Evenflo conducted sled testing of abraded and unabraded tethers at Veridian to determine if [there] was a safety concern with the tethers in use in the field. All test results shared the same basic performance for abraded and unabraded tethers. The testing demonstrated at least a 90 percent margin on tensile strength after abrasion (mean tensile strength after abrasion is 3,101 pounds and the maximum tensile load in sled testing was 1,616 pounds). According to Evenflo, the sled test results clearly demonstrate that there were no potential safety issues associated with abraded or unabraded tethers on the child restraint systems, and that there is more than an adequate margin of safety to protect against failures during reasonably expected usage.