

May 21–23, 2001, the task was discussed, and four task forces were set up to review changes and/or modifications. These task forces identified a series of modifications to the Reporting Guide/regulations for consideration. The Working Group met September 11, 2001; meeting was dismissed due to national emergency. A meeting was held November 14–15, 2001 in St. Louis, Missouri. A Task Force on Remote Control met on December 11, 2001. The working group met January 23–24, 2002, in Baltimore, Maryland, and March 12–13, 2002, in New Orleans, Louisiana. A final meeting was held April 24–25, 2002 in Washington, DC. The Working Group recommendations on the NPRM will be presented to the full RSAC on May 29, 2002. Contact: Robert Finkelstein (202) 493–6280.

Please refer to the notice published in the **Federal Register** on March 11, 1996 (61 FR 9740) for more information about the RSAC.

**George A. Gavalla,**

*Associate Administrator for Safety.*

[FR Doc. 02–12436 Filed 5–16–02; 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 Requirements

Pursuant to Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part 235 and 49 U.S.C. 20502(a), 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 Number FRA–2002–12157]

**Applicant:** CSX Transportation, Incorporated, Mr. Eric G. Peterson, Assistant Chief Engineer, Signal Design and Construction, 4901 Belfort Road, Suite 130 (S/C J–370), Jacksonville, Florida 32256.

CSX Transportation, Incorporated seeks approval of the proposed modification of the signal system on the two main tracks, between milepost CK–4.49 and Parsons Yard, milepost CK–4.54, on the Columbus Subdivision, C&O Division, near Columbus. The proposed changes consist of the discontinuance and removal of Signals H46, HA45, and HB45, and conversion of the method of operation from Rule

D251 to Rule 105 between milepost CK–4.49 and milepost CK–4.54. The proposed changes are associated with the conversion of the automatic block signal system, westward from milepost CK–4.49, to a traffic control system.

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

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 party 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 PI–401, Washington, DC 20590–0001. Communications received within 45 days of the date of this notice will be considered by the 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 a.m.–5 p.m.) at DOT Central Docket Management Facility, Room PI–401 (Plaza Level), 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. 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>.

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, DC on May 13, 2002.

**Grady C. Cothen, Jr.,**

*Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Standards and Program Development.*

[FR Doc. 02–12437 Filed 5–16–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–06–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket NHTSA–99–5087]

#### Safety Performance Standards Program Meeting

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of NHTSA rulemaking status meeting.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces a public meeting at which NHTSA will answer questions from the public and the automobile industry regarding the agency's vehicle regulatory program.

**DATES:** The Agency's regular public meeting relating to its vehicle regulatory program will be held on Thursday, July 18, 2002, beginning at 9:45 a.m. and ending at approximately 12 p.m. at the Hyatt Regency Baltimore, on the Inner Harbor, 300 Light Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202. Questions relating to the vehicle regulatory program must be submitted in writing with a diskette (Microsoft Word) by Thursday, June 20, 2002, to the address shown below or by e-mail. If sufficient time is available, questions received after June 20, may be answered at the meeting. The individual, group or company submitting a question(s) does not have to be present for the question(s) to be answered. A consolidated list of the questions submitted by June 20, 2002, and the issues to be discussed will be posted on NHTSA's web site ([www.nhtsa.dot.gov](http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov)) by Monday, July 15, 2002, and also will be available at the meeting. The agency will hold a second public meeting on July 18, devoted exclusively to a presentation of research and development programs. This meeting will begin at 1:30 p.m. and end at approximately 5 p.m. This meeting is described more fully in a separate announcement. The next NHTSA Public Meeting will take place on Thursday, November 21, 2002, at the Best Western Gateway International Hotel, Romulus, Michigan.

**ADDRESSES:** Questions for the July 18, NHTSA Rulemaking Status Meeting, relating to the agency's vehicle regulatory program, should be submitted to Delia Lopez, NPS–01, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Room 5401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590, Fax Number 202–366–4329, e-mail [dlopez@nhtsa.dot.gov](mailto:dlopez@nhtsa.dot.gov). The meeting will be held at the Hyatt Regency Baltimore, on the Inner Harbor, 300 Light Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202. If you need specific directions to the Hyatt Regency Baltimore, the telephone number is 410–528–1234.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Delia Lopez, (202) 366–1810.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** NHTSA holds regular public meetings to answer questions from the public and the regulated industries regarding the agency's vehicle regulatory program. Questions on aspects of the agency's

research and development activities that relate directly to ongoing regulatory actions should be submitted, as in the past, to the agency's Safety Performance Standards Office. Transcripts of these meetings will be available for public inspection in the DOT Docket in Washington, DC, within four weeks after the meeting. Copies of the transcript will then be available at ten cents a page, (length has varied from 80 to 150 pages) upon request to DOT Docket, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. The DOT Docket is open to the public from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. The transcript may also be accessed electronically at <http://dms.dot.gov>, at docket NHTSA-99-5087. Questions to be answered at the public meeting should be organized by categories to help us process the questions into an agenda form more efficiently.

**Sample format:**

- I. Rulemaking
  - A. Crash avoidance
  - B. Crashworthiness
  - C. Other Rulemakings
- II. Consumer Information
- III. Miscellaneous

NHTSA will provide auxiliary aids to participants as necessary. Any person desiring assistance of "auxiliary aids" (e.g., sign-language interpreter, telecommunications devices for deaf persons (TDDs), readers, taped texts, brailled materials, or large print materials and/or a magnifying device), please contact Delia Lopez on (202) 366-1810, by COB Monday, July 15, 2002.

Issued: May 14, 2002.

**Stephen R. Kratzke,**

*Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.*

[FR Doc. 02-12428 Filed 5-16-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-02-12087; Notice 1]

#### Century Products; Receipt of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Century Products, a Division of Graco Children's Products, Inc. ("Century Products" and "Graco"), of Macedonia, Ohio, has determined that as many as 185,175 child restraints may fail to comply with 49 CFR 571.213, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 213, "Child Restraint Systems," and has filed appropriate reports pursuant to

49 CFR part 573, "Defects and Noncompliance Reports." Century Products 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 safety.

This notice of receipt of an application is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120, and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgement concerning the merits of the application.

FMVSS No. 213, Paragraph S5.1.1, states that when a child restraint system is tested in accordance with S6.1, it shall "exhibit no complete separation of any load bearing structural element and no partial separation exposing either surfaces with a radius of less than 1/4 inch or surfaces with protrusions greater than 3/8 inch above the immediate adjacent surrounding contactable surface of any structural element of the system."

In its part 573 Defect and Noncompliance Report filed with the agency on December 11, 2001, Century Products states "On December 5, 2001, Century Products \* \* \* decided that a noncompliance with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 213 exists in \* \* \* certain \* \* \* "Celestia" model infant car seats manufactured by Century Products \* \* \*." The Celestia infant seat is sold with a detachable base that may be used to permit a fixed installation into the vehicle, allowing the child seat to be taken in and out of the vehicle without having to do a new installation each time. The Celestia infant seat can also be used without the detachable base. Century Products has identified 185,175 Celestia infant car seats manufactured between January 1, 2000 and December 6, 2001 that may contain this noncompliance. In its Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance, Century Products states that it:

has discovered variations in the plastic molding process during the manufacture of the plastic shell of the carrier portion (not the base) of the Subject Products, which can result in a void in the shell wall. This void may cause shell wall separation during the dynamic crash test specified by FMVSS No. 213 when the base is not used, rendering the seat noncompliant \* \* \* There is no noncompliance when the car seat is installed in the vehicle with the base.

In its part 573 Report, Century Products states that:

Graco conducted a dynamic crash test audit of its Celestia infant car seats on December 4, 2001. Graco tested (ten) 10 Celestia infant car seats without the base, randomly taken from inventory. Four (4) of

the ten (10) units exhibited wall separation and the presence of a void at the initiation point of the separation. As a result of this audit testing, Graco determined that a noncompliance existed.

Century Products believes that the FMVSS No. 213 noncompliance described above is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Century Products supports its application for inconsequential noncompliance with the following:

The risk of injury resulting from the wall separation during the dynamic crash test is inconsequential for several reasons. First, the shell wall separation does not affect, increase, or adversely influence the seat back angle. Thus, the restraint systems comply with FMVSS 213 S5.1.4, which provides that "[w]hen a rear-facing child restraint system is tested in accordance with S6.1, the angle between the system's back support surface for the child and the vertical shall not exceed 70 degrees."

Second, all portions of the test dummy's torso were retained within the system and all other requirements regarding target points on either side of the dummy's head comply with FMVSS 213 S5.1.3.2.

Third, the infant shell remained securely attached to the lap belt during testing. The separation did not contribute to any degradation in the ability of the vehicle belt to retain the infant seat in its original position.

Fourth, the shell wall separation did not create an opening that contributes to the pinching, shearing, or scissoring of fingers, toes, or limbs or any other body part of either the occupant or an adjacent child seated next to the infant seat. The seat pad also acts as a mechanism to keep the occupant from contacting the separated area.

Fifth, the shell wall separation occurs at relatively high energy levels, with the separation occurring late in the application of energy of the crash test (as revealed by Century Products' review of the flexing of the infant shell wall). Few motor vehicle accidents occur at the maximum energy levels of the dynamic crash test. The possibility of a wall separation occurring in the field therefore is remote.

Sixth, the shell wall separation occurs only in a high stress area on the shell when the shell is used *without the base*. When the shell is used with the base, the area in question experiences no significant stress. All of the subject products were sold with a stay-in-the-car base. The base is the most predominately used mode with the infant shell due to its convenience of removing the carrier from the vehicle.

Seventh, in the approximately 18 months that the infant shell has been in use in the subject products, there have been no reports of any incidents or complaints regarding the wall separation on the shell.

Eighth, product owners are advised in the accompanying literature that the seat should be discarded following a crash. In addition, it is a well-known industry practice to discontinue using a child restraint after it has experienced a crash. Thus, there is little risk