

NHTSA notes that if Jaguar wishes in the future to modify the device on which this exemption is based, the company may have to submit a petition to modify the exemption. Part 543.7(d) states that a Part 543 exemption applies only to vehicles that belong to a line exempted under this part and equipped with the antitheft device on which the line's exemption is based. Further, Part 543.9(c)(2) provides for the submission of petitions "to modify an exemption to permit the use of an antitheft device similar to but differing from the one specified in that exemption." The agency wishes to minimize the administrative burden with Part 543.9(c)(2) could place on exempted vehicle manufacturers and itself.

The agency did not intend in drafting Part 543 to require the submission of a modification petition for every change to the components or design of an antitheft device. The significance of many such changes could be de minimis. Therefore, NHTSA suggests that if the manufacturer contemplates making any changes the effects of which might be characterized as de minimis, it should consult the agency before preparing and submitting a petition to modify.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 33106; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.

Issued on: December 6, 1995.

Barry Felrice,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 95-30101 Filed 12-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

[Docket No. 95-94; Notice 1]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1991 BMW 735IL Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1991 BMW 735IL passenger cars are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This notice announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that a 1991 BMW 735IL that was not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards is eligible for importation into the United States because (1) It is substantially similar to a vehicle that was originally manufactured for importation into and for sale in the United States and that was certified by its manufacturer as

complying with the safety standards, and (2) it is capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the petition is January 10, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to the docket number and notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Section, Room 5109, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590. (Docket hours are from 9:30 am to 4 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) (formerly section 108(c)(3)(A)(i)(I) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act (the Act)), 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 had decided that the motor vehicle is substantially similar to a motor vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and for sale in the United States, certified under 49 U.S.C. 30115 (formerly section 114 of the Act), 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.

Champagne Imports, Inc. of Lansdale, Pennsylvania ("Champagne") (Registered Importer 90-009) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1991 BMW 735IL passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicle which Champagne believes is substantially similar is the 1991 BMW 735IL that was manufactured for importation into, and sale in, the United States and certified by its manufacturer, Bayerische Motoren Werke A.G., as conforming to all

applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared the non-U.S. certified 1991 BMW 735IL to its U.S. certified counterpart, and found the two vehicles to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Champagne submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that the non-U.S. certified 1991 BMW 735IL, as originally manufactured, conforms to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as its U.S. certified counterpart, or is capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that the non-U.S. certified 1991 BMW 735IL is identical to its U.S. certified counterpart with respect to compliance with Standards Nos. 102 *Transmission Shift Lever Sequence * * **, 103 *Defrosting and Defogging Systems*, 104 *Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems*, 105 *Hydraulic Brake Systems*, 106 *Brake Hoses*, 107 *Reflecting Surfaces*, 109 *New Pneumatic Tires*, 113 *Hood Latch Systems*, 116 *Brake Fluid*, 124 *Accelerator Control 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*, 211 *Wheel Nuts, Wheel Discs and Hubcaps*, 212 *Windshield Retention*, 216 *Roof Crush Resistance*, 219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion*, and 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials*.

Additionally, the petitioner states that the non-U.S. certified 1991 BMW 735IL complies with the Bumper Standard found in 49 CFR part 581.

Petitioner also contends that the vehicle is capable of being readily altered to meet the following standards, in the manner indicated:

Standard No. 101 *Controls and Displays:* (a) Substitution of a lens marked "Brake" for a lens with an ECE symbol on the brake failure indicator lamp; (b) installation of a seat belt warning lamp; (c) recalibration of the speedometer/odometer from kilometers to miles per hour.

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment:* (a) Installation of U.S.-model headlamp assemblies which incorporate sealed beam headlamps; (b) installation of U.S.-model front and rear sidemarker/reflector assemblies; (c) installation of U.S.-model taillamp assemblies; (d)

installation of a high mounted stop lamp.

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

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

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

Standard No. 115 *Vehicle Identification Number*: Installation of a VIN plate that can be read from outside the left windshield pillar, and a VIN reference label on the edge of the door or latch post nearest the driver.

Standard No. 118 *Power Window Systems*: Rewiring of the power window system so that the window transport is inoperative when the ignition is switched off.

Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*: (a) Installation of a U.S.-model seat belt in the driver's position, or a belt webbing actuated microswitch inside the driver's seat belt retractor; (b) installation of an ignition switch-actuated seat belt warning lamp and buzzer; (c) replacement of the driver's side air bag with a U.S.-model component; (d) installation of a U.S.-model knee bolster on the driver's side to augment the automatic restraint system. The petitioner states that the vehicle is equipped in each front designated seating position with a combination lap and shoulder restraint that adjusts by means of an automatic retractor and releases by means of a single push button. The petitioner further states that the vehicle is equipped in each outboard rear designated seating position with a combination lap and shoulder restraint that releases by means of a single push button, and with a lap belt in its rear center seating position.

Standard No. 214 *Side Impact Protection*: Installation of reinforcing beams.

Standard No. 301 *Fuel System Integrity*: Installation of a rollover valve in the fuel tank vent line between the fuel tank and the evaporative emissions collection canister.

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on the petition described above. Comments should refer to the docket number and be submitted to: Docket Section, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Room 5109, 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 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: December 5, 1995.

Marilynne Jacobs,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 95-30033 Filed 12-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-M

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Proposed Information Collection Activity; Public Comment Request: Application for Accreditation as Service Organization Representative, VA Form 21; and Appointment of Attorney or Agent as Claimant's Representative, VA Form 22a

AGENCY: Office of General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: As part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, the Office of General Counsel (OGC) invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on this information collection. This request for comment is being made pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13; 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). Comments should address the accuracy of the burden estimates and ways to minimize the burden including the use of automated collection techniques or the use of other forms of information technology, as well as other relevant aspects of the information collection.

DATES: Written comments and recommendations on the proposal for the collection of information should be received by no later than February 9, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Harold (Butch) Miller, Office of General Counsel (026A), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20420. All comments will become a matter of public record and will be summarized in the OGC request for Office of Management and Budget (OMB)

approval. In this document OGC is soliciting comments concerning the following information collection:

OMB Control Number: 2900-0018.

Title and Form Number: Application for Accreditation as Service Organization Representative, VA Form 21; and Appointment of Attorney or Agent as Claimant's Representative, VA Form 22a.

Type of Review: Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired.

Need and Uses: The forms are used to appoint a service organization, attorney or agent as a representative in claims for VA benefits.

Current Circumstances: VA Form 21 will be evaluated by Office of General Counsel to determine qualification for accreditation and the need for cautionary instructions concerning conflict of interest. Applicants meeting the regulatory standards are issued an ID card allowing them access to VA files of claimants who have designated the service organization with which they are affiliated as claims representative and are issued a letter setting forth their responsibilities. Those denied accreditation, and their organizations, are informed of the reason for the denial. If the information were not collected, VA would have no way of evaluating applicants for accreditation under the requirements of 38 CFR 14.629.

VA Form 22a will be reviewed by VA's Veterans Benefits Administration. The information on the form will be used to ascertain the identity of the representative appointed by the claimant to represent him or her and the scope of the representative's authority to inspect records. This information is necessary for determining whether access to claimant records may be provided and for notification purposes. If the information were not collected, VA could not recognize the representative as the attorney or agent of the claimant under applicable statutes and regulations and could not provide access to claimant records.

Affected Public: Individuals and households, Not-for-profit institutions and State, Local or Tribal Government.

Estimated Annual Burden: 1,650 hours.

Estimated Average Burden Per Respondent: 15 minutes.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 6,600.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the form should be directed to