

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

Written comments on the proposed rule change were neither solicited nor received.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

The Exchange has designated the proposed rule change as a fee change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act⁸ and Rule 19b-4(f)(2) thereunder.⁹ Accordingly, the proposal will take effect upon filing with the Commission. At any time within 60 days of the filing of such proposed rule change, the Commission may summarily abrogate the rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposal is consistent with the Act. Persons making written submissions should file six copies thereof with the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549-0609. Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Room. Copies of such filing will also be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the PCX. All submissions should refer to File No. SR-PCX-2003-05 and should be submitted by March 6, 2003.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.¹⁰

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-3580 Filed 2-12-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2002-13955; Notice 2]

Columbia Body Manufacturing Co.; Grant of Temporary Exemption From Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 224

We are granting the application by Columbia Body Manufacturing Co. ("Columbia") of Clackamas, Oregon, for an exemption of three years from Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 224, *Rear Impact Protection*. Columbia asserted that compliance would cause substantial economic hardship to a manufacturer that has tried in good faith to comply with the standard.

We published a notice of receipt of the application on December 4, 2002, asking for comments from the public (67 FR 72266).

Why Columbia Needs an Exemption

Columbia manufactures and sells a dump body type of trailer (the "trailer") requiring that the body's front end be lifted in order to discharge the load out of the back. The load is asphalt, used in road construction. This design of trailer generally has an overhang at the rear for funneling asphalt material into a paving machine; consequently, the trailer needs 16 to 18 inches of unobstructed clearance behind its rear wheels to hook up with the paving machine and dump its load. Standard No. 224 specifies that the rearmost surface of an underride guard to be located not more than 305mm (12 inches) from the "rear extremity" of the trailer.

Standard No. 224 requires, effective January 26, 1998, that all trailers with a GVWR of 4536 kg or more, including Columbia's, be fitted with a rear impact guard that conforms to Standard No. 223 *Rear impact guards*. Columbia argued that installation of the rear impact guard would prevent its trailer from operating with the paving machine, and "would interfere with the hook-up of the asphalt machine and dump operation of the trailer." Columbia averred that it "has investigated the retrofit and modifications needed to bring our products into compliance with FMVSS 224 without success." We discuss below its efforts to conform in greater detail.

Columbia's Reasons Why it Believes That Compliance Would Cause It Substantial Economic Hardship and That It Has Tried in Good Faith To Comply With Standard No. 224

Columbia is a small volume manufacturer. Its average production

over the past three years has been 12 trailers a year, "none of which were asphalt paving trailers." Normally, it would produce 10 to 40 trailers annually. The company employs 30 people full time and has annual sales of \$4-5,000,000. Columbia "has had requests to quote on 14" trailers and "14 truck mounted dump boxes, bringing the total sales figure to around \$750,000.00." Absent an exemption, Columbia "will be unable to quote these units substantially decreasing our projected sales figures." Its application reflected that its cumulative net loss for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000 was \$99,764. We asked Columbia to provide data on its fiscal year ending December 31, 2001, while the application was pending, and the company replied that its net loss for 2001 was \$755,722.19.

Columbia asserted that it has sought manufacturers of underride guards since 1998. As a result of its search,

We only found one English company, Quinton-Hazell that is no longer making either type, telescoping or hydraulic. Their research found that because of the expense of these two types of guards they would not be marketable. We have also investigated the work done by SRAC, located in Los Angeles, CA in the hopes that we might be able to use or modify the guards they designed for the trailers we wish to build. Neither was suitable because retracting the bumper and finding a way to keep the build up of asphalt off of any moving parts was not possible.

The company stated that it intended to continue to try and resolve the problems through continued research.

Columbia's Reasons Why It Believes That a Temporary Exemption Would Be in the Public Interest and Consistent With Objectives of Motor Vehicle Safety

Columbia argued that an exemption would be in the public interest and consistent with traffic safety objectives because, "our type of trailer helps state and municipal governments to produce the safe highways that are needed." It contemplates building less than 50 units a year while an exemption is in effect. According to Columbia, the amount of time actually spent on the road is limited because of the need to move the asphalt to the job site before it hardens.

Public Comment on the Application

We received one comment in response to our notice of December 4, 2002. The National Truck Equipment Association (NTEA) recommended granting the petition, commenting that "the type of trailer for which Columbia Body is representing a temporary exemption is vital to the proper construction and maintenance of the

⁸ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii).

⁹ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(2).

¹⁰ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

highways.” Like the applicant, NTEA was “unaware of any device that would meet the requirements of FMVSS 224 while allowing this particular type of trailer to perform its intended function.” It reminded us that we have temporarily exempted similar types of trailers from compliance with Standard No. 224.

The Agency’s Findings in Support of an Exemption

Columbia’s present average production of only 12 trailers a year has been insufficient to generate a net profit for the company, and its net loss of over \$750,000 in 2001 reflects a severe downturn in the company’s financial fortunes. It anticipates that it could realize \$750,000 in sales of 14 trailers of the type for which it has requested exemption, and for which potential customers have requested a price quotation. The company has investigated, unsuccessfully, means of compliance with Standard No. 224. There seems to be agreement, as indicated by NTEA’s comment, that there is no feasible way for these trailers to be brought into compliance without compromising the function for which they were designed.

The public interest is served by allowing the production of these special-purpose road construction trailers, balanced against the limited number in which they are produced and the relatively limited time that they spend in transit on the public roads from one job site to another. Further, there is no substantial difference between Columbia Body’s petition and other hardship applications that we have granted in the past (e.g., Red River Manufacturing, Inc. and Dan Hill & Associates, Inc., 66 FR 20028).

Accordingly, for the reasons set above, we hereby find that compliance with Standard No. 224 would cause substantial economic hardship to Columbia Body, which has tried in good faith to comply with Standard No. 224, and we further find that an exemption would be in the public interest and consistent with the objectives of traffic safety. We accordingly grant NHTSA Temporary Exemption No. 2003–1 to Columbia Body Manufacturing Co. for its dump body type trailer only, from 49 CFR 571.224 Standard No. 224, Rear Impact Protection, expiring February 1, 2006.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30113; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.4.

Issued on February 10, 2003.

Jeffrey W. Runge,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 03–3588 Filed 2–12–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Customs Service

Notice of Issuance of Final Determination Concerning Bowling Pinsetters

AGENCY: Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Notice of final determination.

SUMMARY: This document provides notice that Customs has issued a final determination concerning the country of origin of certain bowling pinsetters which are installed at military facilities in the United States and which will be offered to the United States Government. The final determination found that based upon the facts presented, the country of origin of the bowling pinsetters is the United States.

DATES: The final determination was issued on February 7, 2003. A copy of the final determination is attached. Any party-at-interest, as defined in 19 CFR 177.22(d), may seek judicial review of this final determination within 30 days of February 13, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Karen S. Greene, Special Classification and Marking Branch, Office of Regulations and Rulings (202–572–8838).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is hereby given that on February 7, 2003, pursuant to subpart B of part 177, Customs Regulations (19 CFR part 177, subpart B), Customs issued a final determination concerning the country of origin of certain bowling pinsetters offered to the United States Government. The U.S. Customs ruling number is HQ 562583. This final determination was issued at the request of Brunswick Corporation, under procedures set forth at 19 CFR part 177, subpart B, which implements Title III of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2511–18). The final determination concluded that, based upon the facts presented, the assembly in the United States of numerous foreign and U.S. subassemblies and parts to create the pinsetters and the installation of the pinsetters in facilities in the United States result in a substantial transformation of the foreign subassemblies. Accordingly, the country of origin of the bowling pinsetters is the United States.

Section 177.29, Customs Regulations (19 CFR 177.29), provides that notice of final determinations shall be published in the **Federal Register** within 60 days of the date the final determination is issued. Section 177.30, Customs Regulations (19 CFR 177.30), states that

any party-at-interest, as defined in 19 CFR 177.22(d), may seek judicial review of a final determination within 30 days of publication of such determination in the **Federal Register**.

Any party-at-interest, as defined in 19 CFR 177.22(d), may seek judicial review of this final determination within 30 days of (date of publication in the **Federal Register**).

Dated: February 7, 2003.

Michael T. Schmitz,

Assistant Commissioner, Office of Regulations and Rulings.

Attachment.

HQ 562583

MAR–05 RR:CR:SM 562583 KSG

February 7, 2003.

Category: Marking

Richard M. Belanger, Esq.,
Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP, 1501 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005.

Re: Country of origin of bowling pinsetters; substantial transformation; 19 CFR 177.22; procurement.

Dear Mr. Belanger: This is in response to your letters dated November 18, 2002, and January 17, 2003, on behalf of Brunswick Corporation, requesting a final determination of origin pursuant to 19 CFR 177.22(c) regarding U.S. Government procurement of certain bowling pinsetters assembled in the United States.

Facts

Brunswick Corporation is the importer of the components of the bowling pinsetters and therefore, is a party-in-interest as defined in 19 CFR 177.22(d).

This case involves the GS–X model of bowling pinsetters, which are automated machines designed to return bowling balls, pick up standing bowling pins and clear the deck at bowling facilities. The pinsetters are sold to military installations and other U.S. Government entities. This request involves a contract for installation of the GS–X pinsetters at bowling alleys located inside the United States. Brunswick anticipates that it will enter into contracts in the future for facilities at U.S. military bases in foreign countries as well as in the United States.

The GS–X pinsetter is typically sold in sets of two mechanical subassemblies and one electrical controller assembly plus other parts, although Brunswick may occasionally sell a single mechanical assembly with an attached electrical controller. The electrical assembly is manufactured in the United States by Controls, Inc., an unrelated company.

The mechanical assemblies are comprised of seven subassemblies consisting of thousands of components from numerous countries. The mechanical assemblies consist of three major parts: (1) The central block; (2) the “six-pack”; and (3) the ball accelerator. The central block is a large steel box that contains four subassemblies: the sweep wagon subassembly; the setting table subassembly; the drive frame sub-assembly; and the distributor subassemblies. Included in the drive frame subassembly are three