importation into the United States. The vehicles which J.K. believes are substantially similar are 2001 Porsche 911 Turbo 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 Porsche 911 Turbo 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 Porsche 911 Turbo 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 2001 Porsche 911 Turbo 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,* 124 *Accelerator Control Systems,* 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.*

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:* (a) substitution of the word ''Brake'' for the international ECE warning symbol on the markings for the brake failure indicator lamp; (b) replacement of the speedometer with one calibrated in miles per hour. The petitioner states that the entire instrument cluster will be replaced with a U.S.-model component.

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment:* (a) installation of U.S.-model headlamps and front sidemarker lamps; (b) installation of U.S.-model taillamp assemblies which incorporate rear sidemarker lamps; (c) installation of a high mounted stop lamp 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 Mirror:* replacement of the passenger side rearview mirror with a U.S.-model component.

Standard No. 114 *Theft Protection:* installation of a warning buzzer and a warning buzzer microswitch in the steering lock assembly.

Standard No. 118 *Power Window Systems:* installation of a relay in the power window system so that the window transport is inoperative when the ignition is switched off on vehicles that are not already so equipped.

Standard No. 201 *Occupant Protection in Interior Impact:* inspection of all vehicles and replacement of any components subject to the standard that are not identical to those installed on the vehicles' U.S. certified counterparts.

NHTSA has been advised by Porsche, in a June 16, 2000 submission to the agency, that the 2001 model 911 Turbo, available at dealers as of June 2000, is certified to all requirements of Standard 201, including the impact requirements for upper interior components.

Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*: (a) Installation of a seat belt warning buzzer, wired to the driver's seat belt latch; (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. The petitioner states that the vehicles are equipped at the front and rear outboard designated seating positions with combination lap and shoulder belts that are self-tensioning and that release by means of a single red pushbutton.

Standard No. 214 *Side Impact Protection*: inspection of all vehicles and installation of reinforcing door beams on vehicles that are not already so equipped.

Petitioner states that the bumpers and bumper support structure on all vehicles must be inspected for compliance with the Bumper Standard found at 49 CFR Part 581, and replaced, if necessary, to assure compliance with that standard.

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.

Petitioner also states that all vehicles must be inspected prior to importation for compliance with the Theft Prevention Standard at 49 CFR Part 541, and that U.S.-model anti-theft devices must be installed on a vehicles lacking that equipment.

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: August 2, 2000.

Marilynne Jacobs,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 00–19922 Filed 8–4–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA 2000–7657]

General Motors North America, Inc., Receipt of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

General Motors North America, Inc., (GM) has determined that some 1995–1999 model year GM vehicles including Chevrolet and GMC light duty trucks, the Oldsmobile Bravada, Cadillac Escalade, and Pontiac Grand Prix, and Isuzu light duty trucks do not comply with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 118, *Power-operated window, partition, and roof panel systems*. The depression of the hazard warning flasher switch to its limit of travel may activate the retained accessory power (RAP) feature with no key in the ignition. This condition would not meet the operation requirements of S4 of FMVSS 118. A total of 973,922 GM vehicles and 1,540 Isuzu trucks may have this condition. Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and

30120(h), GM has petitioned for a determination that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety and has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, ''Defect and Noncompliance Reports.''

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 judgment concerning the merits of the application.

The hazard warning system flasher switch in the noncompliant vehicles is a pushbutton that operates as a ''push-on /push-off'' switch. To turn the hazard flasher lamps on, the switch is pushed down (depressed) and then released. To turn the hazard flasher lamps off, the switch is depressed a second time and then released.

S4 of FMVSS 118 specifies conditions under which power-operated windows and roof panels may be closed. The relevant portions of S4 require that either the ignition key be in the ''ON'', ''START'', or ''ACCESSORY'' positions (S4(a)), or, in S4(e), that activation be possible only during the interval between removal of the ignition key and opening of either front door. In the affected vehicles, it is possible for the RAP feature to be activated when the hazard flasher switch is at the bottom of travel, whether or not a key is in the ignition.

Under certain conditions, unintended or so-called ''sneak circuits'' may exist if the switch is being depressed and is manually held to its full extent of travel. The sneak circuits disappear when the switch is released. The presence of these sneak circuits can cause the RAP feature to be activated when the key is not in the ignition.

If activated, the RAP would remain operational for up to 20 minutes, depending on the vehicle model, or until a door handle is pulled, whichever occurs first. In some vehicles only the front door handles will deactivate the RAP, while in other models the rear door handles also will deactivate it. While the RAP is activated, it is possible to operate certain vehicle controls, including the power window and sunroof controls.

There are two methods by which RAP can be activated in these vehicles when the key has been removed from the ignition. The first requires depression of the hazard switch to the extreme bottom of travel with some lateral force applied to it. In most switches, RAP cannot be activated by this method, even intentionally by experts attempting to do so. In testing conducted by GM in relation to this condition, GM reports that no child activated RAP by this method.

The second method to activate RAP requires the simultaneous operation of the hazard switch and the service brake. Even if left alone and unattended in a parked vehicle, an individual child would not be likely to depress the hazard switch and the brake pedal simultaneously. In testing conducted by GM the company reports that no individual child ever simultaneously operated the brake and the hazard warning switch.

GM believes that this noncompliance with FMVSS 118 is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Its reasoning is that a number of specific events, each of which has a low possibility of occurring, all would have to occur before an opportunity would exist in which a person could be injured by a power operated window or sunroof.

The petitioner has indicated that the noncompliance will not result in any safety, reliability or serviceability concern for the vehicle operator.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on the application described above. Comments should refer to the docket number and be submitted to: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Management, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, 20590. It is requested that two copies be submitted.

All comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated below will be considered. The application and supporting materials, and all comments received after the closing date, will also be filed and will be considered to the extent possible. When the application is granted or denied, the notice will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below. Comment closing date: September 6, 2000.

(49 U.S.C. 301118, 301120; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8)

Issued on: August 1, 2000.

Stephen R. Kratzke,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 00–19920 Filed 8–4–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

July 28, 2000.

The Department of Treasury has submitted the following public information collection requirement(s) to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling the Treasury Bureau Clearance Officer listed. Comments regarding this information collection should be addressed to the OMB reviewer listed and to the Treasury Department Clearance Officer, Department of the Treasury, Room 2110, 1425 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20220.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before September 6, 2000 to be assured of consideration.

Financial Management Service (FMS)

OMB Number: 1510–0069.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: Administrative Offset, Collection of Past-Due Child Support Final Rule.

Description: The Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996 authorizes the collection of past-due child support by offset of non-tax Federal payments. Executive Order 13019 of September 28, 1996 requires Treasury to promptly develop and implement procedures necessary to implement this authority.

Respondents: State, Local or Tribal Government.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 54.

Estimated Burden Hours Per Respondent: 103 hours.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Estimated Total Reporting Burden: 5,562 hours.

Clearance Officer: Juanita Holder, Financial Management Service, 3700 East West Highway, Room 144, PGP II, Hyattsville, MD 20782.

OMB Reviewer: Alexander T. Hunt, (202) 395–7860, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Lois K. Holland,

Departmental Reports Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 00–19877 Filed 8–4–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–35–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

July 31, 2000.

The Department of Treasury has submitted the following public information collection requirement(s) to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by