manufacturers of these components has certified these products as compliant with FMVSS 119 or 120.'' The most similar components that EGO has located are moped tires and rims. However, the ''performance capabilities of these tires and rims are excessive given the low weight, low speed, and limited range of the eGO. Further, the dimensions of these products are not compatible with the eGO's chassis design or braking system * * *.''

EGO deems its only alternative to develop a specific tire and rim combination. However, testing ''would be an extremely high cost to bear for a manufacturer of a new and innovative low-emission vehicle that is still at an early stage of its product life.'' EGO argues that ''amortizing the cost of testing over the limited number of vehicles sold would significantly increase the cost of this low-emission vehicle, reducing the market for the product and Petitioner's ability to evaluate its performance and market potential.''

In EGO's opinion, an exemption would not unreasonably degrade the safety of the vehicle ''because Petitioner has selected the eGO's rims and tires based on stringent design criteria, considering the operating environment, gross vehicular weight, and top speed of the vehicle.'' Standard No. 119 ''seems especially inappropriate because the eGO cannot, by design, operate continuously for longer than approximately 75 minutes, or be propelled at a speed greater than 20 mph.'' The endurance test (S6.1) ''simulates conditions that would never be encountered by the operator of the vehicle simply by nature of the vehicle's design and performance restraints.'' The purpose of Standard No. 120, in EGO's view ''is to assure that a consumer will be able to purchase a tire that fits a given rim, and that any tire purchased in a given size will fit a rim of that size.'' The petitioner believes it has achieved that purpose in the tires and rims it has selected for the eGO, and it will encourage owners ''to use the replacement rims that we specify in the documentation provided with the vehicle.''

According to eGO, an exemption would be in the public interest as supporting an innovative low-cost, low-emission means of transportation. An exemption would be consistent with the objectives of traffic safety because the petitioner intends to comply with the regulations that the Consumer Product Safety Commission has promulgated for bicycles. The petitioner also points out that no tire and rim requirements are imposed by Standard No. 500, *Low-speed Vehicles,* on passenger-carrying vehicles with a slightly higher maximum speed (20 to 25 mph).

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on the application described above. Comments should refer to the docket number and the notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. It is requested but not required that 10 copies be submitted.

All comments received before the close of business on the comment closing date indicated below 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 application will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below. *Comment closing date:* March 15, 2001.

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

Issued on February 8, 2001.

Stephen R. Kratzke,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 01–3664 Filed 2–12–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA 2000–7705, Notice 1]

Receipt of Applications for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

The following companies, Osram Sylvania Products, Inc., (Osram); Subaru of America, Inc., (Subaru); Koito Manufacturing Co., LTD. (Koito); North American Lighting, Inc. (NAL); Stanley Electric Co., LTD, (Stanley); and General Electric Company (GE) have determined that certain H1 replaceable light sources they manufactured or used in lamp assemblies did not have the ''DOT'' marking required under Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 108, ''Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment.''

This notice of receipt of these applications 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 applications.

Under the requirements of S7.7(a) of FMVSS No. 108, each replaceable light source shall be marked with the symbol ''DOT.''

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h), the above companies have petitioned for a determination that their failure to mark light sources with ''DOT'' is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety and have filed appropriate reports pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, ''Defect and Noncompliance Reports.''

Osram produced 841,283 H1 replaceable light sources without the required ''DOT '' marking. In its part 573 report, Osram stated that it was not possible to determine exactly how many light sources were used in headlamp assemblies as opposed to those which were used in fog lamp assemblies.

Between February 1999 and January 2000, NAL used 118,756 of these Osram replaceable light sources in headlamp assemblies. Subaru installed 110,784 of these NAL headlamp assemblies in model year 2000 Legacy vehicles from February 1999 through February 2000.

Stanley used 30,426 of the Osram replaceable light sources in headlamp assemblies intended for Honda Preludes produced between October 22, 1998 and January 27, 2000. Koito used 12,340 of the Osram replaceable light sources in headlamp assemblies it manufactured between June 1999 and January 2000.

A separate group of replaceable light sources with the same noncompliance was manufactured by GE. GE produced 2,490 of these between April 1, 1999 and March 23, 2000. The GE replaceable light sources are included in this notice for simplicity because the issue is identical.

All of the petitioners have indicated that the subject replaceable light sources, with the exception of the absence of the ''DOT'' marking, fully comply with all the performance and design requirements of FMVSS No. 108 and do not constitute any risk to motor vehicle safety. Osram has submitted confidential test data to show this.

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: March 15, 2001.

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

Issued on: February 2, 2001.

Stephen R. Kratzke,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 01–3558 Filed 2–12–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA 2001–8808, Notice 1]

Philips Lighting Company Receipt of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Philips Lighting Company, Somerset, New Jersey, has determined that certain H3–55W replaceable light sources it manufactured do not have the ''DOT'' marking required under Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 108, ''Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment.'' The total number of light sources sold without this marking from January 1998 to December 1999 was 67,299.

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.

Under the requirements of S7.7(a) of FMVSS No. 108, each replaceable light source shall be marked with the symbol ''DOT.''

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h), Philips Lighting Company has petitioned for a determination that its failure to mark light sources with ''DOT'' is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety and has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, ''Defect and Noncompliance Reports.''

Philips Lighting Company has indicated that the subject replaceable light source, with the exception of the absence of the ''DOT'' marking, fully complies with all the performance and design requirements of FMVSS No. 108 and does not constitute any risk to motor vehicle safety and has submitted test results to show this.

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: March 15, 2001.

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

Issued on: February 8, 2001.

Noble N. Bowie,

Acting Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 01–3630 Filed 2–12–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Research and Special Programs Administration

Office of Hazardous Materials Safety; Notice of Delays in Processing of Exemption Applications

AGENCY: Research and Special Programs Administration, DOT.

ACTION: List of applications delayed more than 180 days.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the requirements of 49 U.S.C. 5117(c), RSPA is publishing the following list of exemption applications that have been in process for 180 days or more. The reason(s) for delay and the expected completion date for action on each application is provided in association with each identified application.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: J. Suzanne Hedgepeth, Director, Office of Hazardous Materials, Exemptions and Approvals, Research and Special Programs Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590–0001, (202) 366–4535.

Key to ''Reasons for Delay''

1. Awaiting additional information from applicant.

2. Extensive public comment under review.

3. Application is technically complex and is of significant impact or precedent-setting and requires extensive analysis.

4. Staff review delayed by other priority issues or volume of exemption applications.

Meaning of Application Number Suffixes

N—New application.

M—Modification request.

PM—Party to application with modification request.

Issued in Washington, DC, on February 6, 2001.

J. Suzanne Hedgepeth,

Director, Office of Hazardous Materials, Exemptions and Approvals.

Application No.	Applicant	Reason for delay	Estimated date of completion
	New Exemption Applications		
11862–N	The BOC Group, Murray Hill, NJ	4	03/30/2001
11927–N	Alaska Marine Lines, Inc., Seattle, WA	4	03/30/2001
12142–N	Aristech Chemical Corp., Pittsburgh, PA	4	03/30/2001
12158–N	Hickson Corporation, Conley, GA	4	03/30/2001
12181–N	Aristech, Pittsburgh, PA	4	03/30/2001
12248–N	Ciba Specialty Chemicals Corp., High Point, NC	4	03/30/2001
12290–N	Savage Industries, Inc., Pottstown, PA	4	03/30/2001
12307–N	Kern County Dept. of Weights & Measures, Bakersfield, CA	4	03/30/2001
12339–N	BOC Gases, Murray Hill, NJ	4	03/30/2001
12353–N	Monson Companies, South Portland, ME	4	03/30/2001
12355–N	Union Tank Car Company, East Chicago, IN	4	03/30/2001
12381–N	Ideal Chemical & Supply Co., Memphis, TN	4	03/30/2001