

sidewall marking on the intended outboard sidewall of the subject tires describes the maximum load in kilograms incorrectly. Specifically, the tires in question were inadvertently marked with a maximum load of 1350 kg. The labeling should have read 1320 kg.

**Rule text:** Paragraph S5.5(d) of FMVSS No. 139 require in pertinent part:

S5.5 Tire markings. Except as specified in paragraphs (a) through (i) of S5.5, each tire must be marked on each sidewall with the information specified in S5.5(a) through (d) and on one sidewall with the information specified in S5.5(e) through (i) according to the phase-in schedule specified in S7 of this standard. The markings must be placed between the maximum section width and the bead on at least one sidewall, unless the maximum section width of the tire is located in an area that is not more than one-fourth of the distance from the bead to the shoulder of the tire. If the maximum section width falls within that area, those markings must appear between the bead and a point one-half the distance from the bead to the shoulder of the tire, on at least one sidewall. The markings must be in letters and numerals not less than 0.078 inches high and raised above or sunk below the tire surface not less than 0.015 inches \* \* \*

(d) The maximum load rating and for LT tires, the letter designating the tire load range; \* \* \*

#### Summary of Bridgestone's Analysis and Arguments

Bridgestone explains that while the noncompliant tires are mislabeled; the tires do in fact have the correct marking for the maximum load in pounds on the intended outboard sidewall, and the maximum load marking in both pounds and kg is correct on the intended inboard sidewall. The tires also meet or exceed all other applicable FMVSS.

Bridgestone argues that the subject mismarking is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety and is unlikely to have an adverse impact on motor vehicle safety since the actual performance of the subject tires will not be affected by the mismarking. Bridgestone supports this belief by stating that the tires met the performance requirements of FMVSS No. 139 for endurance and high speed when tested at the 1350 kg load.

Bridgestone also points out its belief that NHTSA has previously granted similar petitions for non-compliances in sidewall marking.

In summation, Bridgestone believes that the described noncompliance of its tires to meet the requirements of FMVSS No. 139 is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that its petition, to exempt from providing recall notification of noncompliance as

required by 49 U.S.C. 30118 and remedying the recall noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30120 should be granted.

**Comments:** Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on this petition. Comments must refer to the docket and notice number cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted by any of the following methods:

a. *By mail addressed to:* U.S.

Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590.

b. *By hand delivery to* U.S.

Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. except Federal Holidays.

c. *Electronically:* by logging onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Web site at <http://www.regulations.gov/>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Comments may also be faxed to 1-202-493-2251.

Comments must be written in the English language, and be no greater than 15 pages in length, although there is no limit to the length of necessary attachments to the comments. If comments are submitted in hard copy form, please ensure that two copies are provided. If you wish to receive confirmation that your comments were received, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard with the comments. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to [http://www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov/), including any personal information provided.

Documents submitted to a docket may be viewed by anyone at the address and times given above. The documents may also be viewed on the Internet at [http://www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov/) by following the online instructions for accessing the dockets. DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement is available for review in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000, (65 FR 19477-78).

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

*Comment closing date:* May 4, 2012.

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; delegations of authority at CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on: March 29, 2012.

**Claude H. Harris,**  
Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2012-8050 Filed 4-3-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2011-0083; Notice 1]

#### Michelin North America, Inc., Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

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

**ACTION:** Receipt of Petition.

**SUMMARY:** Michelin North America, Inc.<sup>1</sup> (MNA) has determined that certain Michelin brand passenger car replacement tires, do not fully comply with paragraph S5.5<sup>2</sup> of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 139, *New pneumatic radial tires for light vehicles*. MNA has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports* (dated June 2, 2011).

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) (see implementing rule at 49 CFR part 556), MNA has petitioned for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

This notice of receipt of MNA's petition 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 petition.

**Tires involved:** Affected are approximately 17,500 Michelin Primacy MXV4 TL passenger car replacement tires labeled as sizes P205 65 R15 94H, P205 65 R15 94V, and P225 55 R17 97H that were manufactured by SC Michelin Romania SA in Victoria, Romania between January 9, 2011 and May 28, 2011.

<sup>1</sup> Michelin North America, Inc. is a New York corporation that manufactures and imports motor vehicle replacement equipment.

<sup>2</sup> In its petition MNA states its belief that the subject tires do not meet the load marking requirements of 49 CFR 571.139 S5.5(d). However, the actual noncompliance is due to an error in the tire size designation marking required by 49 CFR 571.139 S5.5(b) which causes the load marking to appear to be incorrect.

NHTSA notes that the statutory provisions (49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h)) that permit manufacturers to file petitions for a determination of inconsequentiality allow NHTSA to exempt manufacturers only from the duties found in sections 30118 and 30120, respectively, to notify owners, purchasers, and dealers of a defect or noncompliance and to remedy the defect or noncompliance. Therefore, these provisions only apply to the subject 17,500<sup>3</sup> Michelin Primacy MXV4 TL passenger car replacement tires that MNA no longer controlled at the time it determined that the noncompliance existed.

Paragraph S5.5 of FMVSS No. 139 requires in pertinent part:

S5.5 Tire markings. Except as specified in paragraphs (a) through (i) of S5.5 each tire must be marked on each sidewall with the information specified in S5.5 (a) through (d) and on one sidewall with the information specified in S5.5 (e) through (i) according to the phase-in schedule specified in S7 of this standard. The markings must be placed between the maximum section width and the bead on at least one sidewall, unless the maximum section width of the tire is located in an area that is not more than one-fourth of the distance from the bead to the shoulder of the tire. If the maximum section width falls within that area, those markings must appear between the bead and a point one-half the distance from the bead to the shoulder of the tire, on at least one sidewall. The markings must be in letters and numerals not less than 0.078 inches high and raised above or sunk below the tire surface not less than 0.015 inches\* \* \*

(b) The tire size designation as listed in the documents and publications specified in S4.1.1 of this standard;\* \* \*

**Noncompliance:** MNA explained that the noncompliance is a tire sidewall labeling error. A prefix letter "P" was inadvertently added to the tire size designation required by paragraph S5.5 (b) by FMVSS No. 139.

The tire was designed to comply with the ETRTO standard for maximum load and inflation pressure. The Max Load and Max Pressure markings on the tire are correct and the tire passes all certification requirements at the marked loads/pressures under 49 CFR 571.139. The mix of ETRTO loads with the "P"-metric size designation causes the tire to be noncompliant with both the ETRTO

standard and the T&RA standard, thus becoming noncompliant with the labeling requirements of 49 CFR Part 571.139 S5.5. All other markings are compliant with the FMVSS requirements.

MNA stated its belief that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety for the following reasons:

(1) Both the 205/65 R15 and the 225/55 R17 radial tires, each tire was originally conceived as a Euro-metric radial tire. Both tires when certifying to DOT requirements were tested in accordance with safety standard FMVSS No. 139 as well as the ETRTO standard for dimensions, pressure, load, and performance. To which the subject tires meet or exceed all of the minimum performance requirements for FMVSS No. 139 at the load and pressure marked on the respective sidewall.

(2) The P-metric version of the tire dimensions specify a maximum load and pressure that is less than the maximum load and associated pressure of the Euro-metric dimension. Performance capabilities as P-metric dimensions exceed all P-metric requirements.

(3) Should the subject tires be selected and fitted based on their markings, no possibility of tire overloading exists.

(4) The P-metric dimensional marks on the subject tires would be treated as such in the replacement market. Which at the dealer or consumer level, the inconsistency between the dimensional marking and the maximum load marking may lead to some confusion at the time of installation but fitment would still be acceptable.

(5) Whether the tires are fitted as P-metric dimensions per the current industry fitment guide, or fitted according to the subject tire's sidewall's maximum load. These tires do not risk the possibility of being overloaded when making a replacement tire selection for vehicle fitment.

In addition, MNA states that it has corrected the problem that caused the noncompliance so that it will not reoccur in future production.

In summation, MNA believes that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that its petition, to exempt it from providing recall notification of noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30118 and remedying the recall noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30120 should be granted.

**Comments:** Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on this petition. Comments must refer to the docket and notice number cited at the beginning of

this notice and be submitted by any of the following methods:

a. By mail addressed to: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590.

b. By hand delivery to U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. except Federal Holidays.

c. Electronically: by logging onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Web site at <http://www.regulations.gov/>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Comments may also be faxed to 1-202-493-2251.

Comments must be written in the English language, and be no greater than 15 pages in length, although there is no limit to the length of necessary attachments to the comments. If comments are submitted in hard copy form, please ensure that two copies are provided. If you wish to receive confirmation that your comments were received, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard with the comments. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to [http://www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov/), including any personal information provided.

Documents submitted to a docket may be viewed by anyone at the address and times given above. The documents may also be viewed on the Internet at [http://www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov/) by following the online instructions for accessing the dockets. DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement is available for review in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000, (65 FR 19477-78).

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

**DATES:** Comment closing date: May 4, 2012.

<sup>3</sup> MNA's petition, which was filed under 49 CFR part 556, requests an agency decision to exempt MNA as a motor vehicle replacement equipment manufacturer from the notification and recall responsibilities of 49 CFR part 573 for 17,500 of the affected vehicles. However, a decision on this petition cannot relieve vehicle distributors and dealers of the prohibitions on the sale, offer for sale, introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of the noncompliant tires under their control after MNA notified them that the subject noncompliance existed.

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; delegations of authority at CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

**Claude H. Harris,**  
*Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.*  
 [FR Doc. 2012-8051 Filed 4-3-12; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2012-0035, Notice 1]

#### Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1999 to 2006 Toyota Land Cruiser IFS 100 Series Multipurpose Passenger Vehicles Manufactured Prior to September 1, 2006 Are Eligible for Importation

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

**ACTION:** Notice of receipt of petition.

**SUMMARY:** This document announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that nonconforming 1999 to 2006 Toyota Land Cruiser IFS 100 Series multipurpose passenger vehicles (MPVs) manufactured prior to September 1, 2006 that were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSS), are eligible for importation into the United States because they are substantially similar to vehicles that were originally manufactured for sale in the United States and that were certified by their manufacturer as complying with the safety standards (the U.S.-certified version of the 1999 to 2006 Toyota Land Cruiser IFS 100 Series MPV manufactured prior to September 1, 2006) and they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

**DATES:** The closing date for comments on the petition is May 4, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should refer to the docket and notice numbers above and be submitted by any of the following methods:

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

- *Mail:* Docket Management Facility: U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, Washington, DC 20590-0001.

- *Hand Delivery or Courier:* West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. ET, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

- *Fax:* 202-493-2251.

**Instructions:** Comments must be written in the English language, and be no greater than 15 pages in length, although there is no limit to the length of necessary attachments to the comments. If comments are submitted in hard copy form, please ensure that two copies are provided. If you wish to receive confirmation that your comments were received, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard with the comments. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided. Please see the Privacy Act heading below.

**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 (65 FR 19477-78).

**How to Read Comments Submitted to the Docket:** You may read the comments received by Docket Management at the address and times given above. You may also view the documents from the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for accessing the dockets. The docket ID number and title of this notice are shown at the heading of this document notice. Please note that even after the comment closing date, we will continue to file relevant information in the Docket as it becomes available. Further, some people may submit late comments. Accordingly, we recommend that you periodically search the Docket for new material.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

George Stevens, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202-366-5308).

#### 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 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.

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**.

US SPECS, of Havre de Grace, Maryland (Registered Importer 03-321) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether nonconforming 1999 to 2006 Toyota Land Cruiser IFS 100 Series MPVs manufactured prior to September 1, 2006 are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles which US SPECS believes are substantially similar are 1999 to 2006 Toyota Land Cruiser IFS 100 Series MPVs manufactured prior to September 1, 2006 that were manufactured for sale in the United States and certified by their manufacturer as conforming to all applicable FMVSS.

The petitioner claims that it compared non-U.S. certified nonconforming 1999 to 2006 Toyota Land Cruiser IFS 100 Series MPVs manufactured prior to September 1, 2006 to their U.S.-certified counterparts, and found the vehicles to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most FMVSS.

US SPECS submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 1999 to 2006 Toyota Land Cruiser IFS 100 Series MPVs manufactured prior to September 1, 2006 as originally manufactured, conform to many FMVSS 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 1999 to 2006 Toyota Land Cruiser IFS 100 Series MPVs manufactured prior to September 1, 2006 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*, 105 *Hydraulic and Electric Brake Systems*, 106 *Brake*