

Ferrari stated that its inability to sell the F430 in the United States through 2007 would lead to a substantial loss of sales and revenue. Ferrari stated that in 2004, sales of the 8-cylinder 360 models, those models being replaced by the F430, accounted for 86 percent of its U.S. sales. Ferrari projected that if it were unable to sell the F430 model in the U.S., it would realize a decrease in net profit of approximately 44 million Euros (\$53,000,000) in 2007. Ferrari stated that such consequences demonstrate "substantial economic hardship" within the meaning of 49 U.S.C. 30113(b)(3)(B)(i).

Ferrari has requested that additional specific details regarding its finances and financial forecasts be afforded confidential treatment under 49 CFR 512.4, *Asserting a claim for confidential information*. We have determined that this information is to be afforded such treatment.

III. Why an Exemption Would Be in the Public Interest

The petitioner put forth several arguments in favor of a finding that the requested exemption is consistent with the public interest. Specifically:

1. Ferrari states that the vehicle is equipped with a variety of "active safety" systems beyond that required by the FMVSSs and that these systems "significantly improve vehicle handling and enhance controllability." Such systems include the Manettino control system, which adjusts vehicle handling and stability to specific driving conditions; the Control Stability System, an electronic stability control system; Electro-Hydraulic Differential, a system that manages torque distribution between the two rear wheels to improve stability; Continuous Damping Control, a system that adjusts to road conditions in order to improve braking; and "Sky-Hook" strategy.²

2. The petitioner states that the F430 also has a variety of passive safety features not required under the FMVSS, including seat belt pretensioners and a fuel system that complies with the upgraded fuel system integrity requirements in advance of the compliance date.

3. Ferrari notes that the requirements for which the F430 does not comply are primarily designed to protect children from injuries due to air bag deployment. Ferrari argues that it is unlikely that

young children would be passengers in the vehicles covered by the exemption.

4. Ferrari states that the F430 will have a manual on/off switch for the passenger air bag. Ferrari also notes that a child restraint system that automatically suppresses the passenger air bag when properly installed would be available upon request of a consumer at no cost.

5. Ferrari states that the F430 was designed and marketed as a high performance, racing type vehicle, and therefore would have negligible on-road operation. Thus, Ferrari states, the impact of the exemption is expected to be minimal.

6. Ferrari argues that granting the exemption would increase choices available to the U.S. driving population in the high-performance vehicle segment.

7. The petitioner argues that granting the exemption would maintain the viability of U.S. firms associated with the sales and maintenance associated with the F430. Ferrari projects the F430 to be a major part of Ferrari sales in the U.S. during the two-year period for which an exemption has been requested.

IV. How You May Comment on the Ferrari Application

We invite you to submit comments on the application described above. You may submit comments [identified by the DOT Docket number in the heading of this document] by any of the following methods:

- Web Site: <http://dms.dot.gov>.

Follow the instructions for submitting comments on the DOT electronic docket site by clicking on "Help and Information" or "Help/Info."

- Fax: 1-202-493-2251.

• Mail: Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL-401, Washington, DC 20590.

• Hand Delivery: Room PL-401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.

• Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

Instructions: All submissions must include the agency name and docket number or Regulatory Identification Number (RIN) for this rulemaking. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to <http://dms.dot.gov>, including any personal information provided.

Docket: For access to the docket in order to read background documents or comments received, go to <http://dms.dot.gov> at any time or to Room PL-401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Privacy Act: Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477-78) or you may visit <http://dms.dot.gov>.

We shall consider all comments received before the close of business on the comment closing date indicated below. To the extent possible, we shall also consider comments filed after the closing date. We shall publish a notice of final action on the application in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

(49 U.S.C. 30113; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50. and 501.8)

Issued on: November 18, 2005.

Roger A. Saul,

Director, Office of Crashworthiness Standards.

[FR Doc. E5-6551 Filed 11-25-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2005-23083]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 2005 Lamborghini Murcielago Roadster Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 2005 Lamborghini Murcielago roadster 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 2005 Lamborghini Murcielago roadster passenger cars that were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety

² The "Skyhook" strategy detaches the vehicle body, as a sprung mass, from what is taking place on the axles and wheels by calming the movement of the body * * * In addition to improved comfort, this provides for "optimal control of the vehicle body at all times." Page 10 of the petition.

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 28, 2005.

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 a.m. to 5 p.m.]. Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477-78) or you may visit <http://dms.dot.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Coleman Sachs, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202-366-3151).

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**.

Automobile Concepts, Inc. ("AMC"), of North Miami, Florida (Registered Importer 01-278) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether nonconforming 2005 Lamborghini Murcielago roadster passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles which AMC believes are substantially similar are 2005 Lamborghini Murcielago roadster 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 2005 Lamborghini Murcielago roadster 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.

AMC submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 2005 Lamborghini Murcielago roadster passenger cars, as originally manufactured, 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 2005 Lamborghini Murcielago roadster passenger cars are identical to their U.S. certified counterparts with respect to compliance with Standard Nos. 102 *Transmission Shift Lever Sequence, Starter Interlock, and Transmission Braking Effect*, 103 *Windshield Defrosting and Defogging Systems*, 104 *Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems*, 106 *Brake Hoses*, 109 *New Pneumatic Tires*, 113 *Hood Latch System*, 116 *Motor Vehicle Brake Fluids*, 118 *Power-Operated Window, Partition, and Roof Panel 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*, 212 *Windshield Mounting*, 214 *Side Impact Protection*, 219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion*, 225 *Child Restraint Anchorage Systems*, 301 *Fuel System Integrity*, 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials*, and 401 *Interior Trunk Release*.

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: Installation of a U.S.-model instrument cluster and associated software, or installation of an indicator lamp lens cover inscribed with the word "brake" in the instrument cluster in place of the one inscribed with the international ECE warning symbol and conversion of the speedometer to read in miles per hour.

Standard No. 108 Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment: (A) Installation of rear side marker lamps that incorporate rear side-mounted reflex reflectors; and (b) inspection of all vehicles and replacement of any non U.S.-model components necessary to meet the requirements of this standard with U.S.-model components on vehicles that are not already so equipped.

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

Standard No. 111 Rearview Mirrors: Installation of a U.S.-model passenger side rearview mirror, or inscription of the required warning statement on the face of that mirror.

Standard No. 114 Theft Protection: Installation of U.S. version software, or installation a supplemental warning buzzer to meet the requirements of this standard.

Standard No. 208 Occupant Crash Protection: (a) Installation of U.S. version software, or installation of a supplemental buzzer system to ensure that the seat belt warning system conforms to the requirements of this standard; and (b) inspection of all vehicles and replacement of any non U.S.-model components necessary to meet the requirements of this standard with U.S.-model components on vehicles that are not already so equipped.

Petitioner states that the restraint systems used at the front outboard seating positions include airbags and knee bolsters as well as combination lap and shoulder belts. These seat belt systems are self-tensioning and release by means of a single red pushbutton.

Standard No. 209 Seat Belt Assemblies: Inspection of all vehicles and replacement of any non-U.S.-model seat belts with U.S.-model components on vehicles that are not already so equipped.

Standard No. 210 Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages: Inspection of all vehicles and replacement of any non-U.S.-model seat belt anchorages with U.S.-model components on vehicles that are not already so equipped.

The petitioner additionally states that a vehicle identification plate must be affixed to the vehicles near the left windshield 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 a.m. to 5 p.m.]. 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.

Claude H. Harris,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.
[FR Doc. E5-6529 Filed 11-25-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2005-22654]

Notice of Tentative Decision To Partially Rescind Decision That Nonconforming 1990-1999 Nissan GTS and GTR Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

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

ACTION: Notice of tentative decision to partially rescind decision that nonconforming 1990-1999 Nissan GTS and GTR passenger cars are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This document provides notice that NHTSA has tentatively decided to partially rescind its decision that 1990-1999 Nissan GTS and GTR passenger cars not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards (FMVSS) are eligible for importation into the United States. If NHTSA makes this rescission, Nissan R33 model GTS and GTR passenger cars manufactured between January 1996 and June 1998 would be eligible for

importation following the decision; the others would not be eligible for importation following the decision.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the tentative decision is December 28, 2005.

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 a.m. to 5 p.m.] Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477-78) or you may visit <http://dms.dot.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Coleman Sachs, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202-366-3151).

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 (FMVSS) 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 FMVSS. Where there is no substantially similar U.S.-certified motor vehicle, 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(B) permits a nonconforming motor vehicle to be admitted into the United States if its safety features comply with, or are capable of being altered to comply with, all applicable FMVSS based on destructive test data or other evidence (such as an engineering analysis) that NHTSA decides is adequate.

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**.

NHTSA was petitioned by a registered importer to decide whether 1990-1999 Nissan GTS and GTR Passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. To afford an opportunity for public comment, NHTSA published notice of this petition under Docket Number NHTSA-99-5507 on April 16, 1999 (64 FR 18963). As stated in the notice, the petitioner claimed that 1990-1999 Nissan GTS and GTR passenger cars have safety features that comply with many standards that apply to passenger cars of the model years in question, and are capable of being altered to comply with other applicable standards. With respect to FMVSS No. 208 Occupant Crash Protection, the petitioner stated that the driver's air bags on 1990-1993 models, and the driver and passenger's air bags on 1994-1999 models, would need to be replaced with components manufactured to petitioner's specifications based on the results of dynamic tests conducted by MGA Research Corporation. As indicated by the petitioner, these tests were conducted after it had made certain structural modifications to the vehicles.

No comments were received in response to the notice of petition. Based on its review of the information submitted by the petitioner, NHTSA granted the petition on November 15, 1999, and assigned Vehicle Eligibility Number VCP-17 to vehicles admissible under its decision. The agency published notice of the decision on January 19, 2000 (65 FR 3002).

The agency has obtained information from Nissan North America, Inc., on behalf of Nissan Motor Company, LTD (Nissan) of Tokyo, Japan, the manufacturer of Nissan 1990-1999 Nissan GTS and GTR passenger cars. Nissan informed the agency that it manufactured three distinct GTS and GTR models from 1990 to 1999, designated as the R32, the R33, and the R34 models, respectively. Nissan stated that the R32, the R33, and the R34 models differ in terms of their "structural design and restraint performance," and that each of the models, which followed a chronological sequence, was "newly designed and different from the type preceding it." Nissan confirmed that the company received official type approval from the Japanese government for each model separately, and that it was "highly likely that each model type would perform differently in the crash tests required by the FMVSS."