

directly above and to the rear of the fuel lines in the right rear quadrant of the engine compartment of the subject vehicles.

After receipt of the petition, NHTSA reviewed its consumer complaint files and found ten complaints of engine compartment fires in the subject vehicles, including two of the vehicles cited in the petition. Five of the reports were attributed to an automatic transmission fluid problem, one to an oil leak, one to a fuel system defect, and three did not allege a cause. The single complaint alleging fuel system failure involved one of the vehicle fires cited by the petitioner. No additional reports alleging fuel system failure were discovered in the consumer complaint file search.

NHTSA also contacted Isuzu to request information pertaining to the alleged defect. Included in Isuzu's response were five additional reports of engine compartment fire alleging some failure of the fuel supply system. Analysis of these reports, and the three submitted with the petition, found no evidence of a defect trend related to the fuel system. Instead, the seven reports mentioning fuel system involvement were found to allege a variety of failure modes, including abrasion of the fuel line from contact with other engine components, inadequate thread engagement at the throttle body injector inlet connection, heat damage to the fuel lines either from the air pump bypass valve, routing of the fuel lines too close to the exhaust manifold, and unspecified failure of the fuel system. As previously noted, one of the reports submitted with the petition did not identify any failure of the fuel system, but was included simply as another engine compartment fire. These reports, rather than showing evidence of a defect trend, highlight the absence of a common failure mode in the fuel system of the subject vehicles.

The only failure mode identified in more than one allegation was that the fuel line was routed too close to the exhaust manifold, cited in two reports. One of these reports referred to that problem as "the most likely" cause while the second report was based solely on a cursory inspection of an engine compartment by a fire department official. In both cases, the conclusions were based on examination of an engine compartment where extensive fire damage had occurred. The petitioner's contention that these or other fires were "positively identified" as fuel line related is not supported by the facts. The characteristic failure mode of the automatic transmission system, as previously described,

suggests that wetting by transmission oil is another, more likely, cause of engine compartment fires. Both of these reports, as well as some of the remaining six, described circumstances or symptoms consistent with the condition remedied in Recall 90V-167. Specifically, long trips with high engine loads, such as driving in mountainous areas, causes the transmission fluid temperature to rise and increases the potential for fluid expulsion through the transmission filler pipe onto the hot engine. Intermittent trace evidence of smoke from under the hood prior to the actual fire, unaccompanied by engine stalling or hesitation, is also more consistent with a transmission fluid fire than a fuel fed fire. In any event, NHTSA's examination of the fuel supply system in the subject vehicles does not support a finding of either improper routing or mounting of the fuel lines.

It is noteworthy that the only common element identified in the complaints received from the petitioner and Isuzu is that all eight involved vehicles are equipped with automatic transmissions, though almost half of the subject vehicles are equipped with manual transmissions. Since the fuel supply system is the same in all subject vehicles, the absence of such fires in those equipped with manual transmission would not be expected for a defect involving the fuel system. After review of all available information, no evidence of a safety-related defect trend involving the fuel supply system was discovered.

In consideration of the available information it was concluded that there was not a reasonable possibility that an order concerning the notification and remedy of a safety-related defect in relation to the petitioner's allegations would be issued at the conclusion of an investigation. Since no evidence of a safety-related defect trend was discovered, further commitment of resources to determine whether such a trend may exist does not appear to be warranted. Therefore, the petition is hereby denied.

**Authority:** Sec. 124, Pub. L. 93-492; 88 Stat. 1470 (15 U.S.C. 1410a); delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on: November 25, 1992.

**William A. Boehly,**

*Associate Administrator for Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. 92-29167 Filed 12-1-92; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-M

## Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation

### Advisory Board; Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463; 5 U.S.C. app. I) notice is hereby given of a meeting of the Advisory Board of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, to be held at 11 a.m., December 9, 1992, at the Corporation's Administration Headquarters, room 5424, 400 7th Street, SW., Washington, DC, via conference call. The agenda for this meeting will be as follows: Opening Remarks; Consideration of Minutes of Past Meeting; Review of Programs; Business; and Closing Remarks.

Attendance at meeting is open to the interested public but limited to the space available. With the approval of the Administrator, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing further information should contact not later than December 4, 1992, Marc C. Owen, Advisory Board Liaison, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590; 202-366-0091.

Any member of the public may present a written statement to the Advisory Board at any time.

Issued at Washington, DC on November 24, 1992.

**Marc C. Owen,**

*Advisory Board Liaison.*

[FR Doc. 92-29149 Filed 12-1-92; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-61-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

[Number: 15-24]

### Authority of Deputy Assistant Secretary (Regulatory, Tariff and Trade Enforcement)

November 24, 1992.

1. *Delegation.* By virtue of the authority vested in the Assistant Secretary (Enforcement) under Treasury Order (TO) 101-05, I hereby delegate to the Deputy Assistant Secretary (Regulatory, Tariff and Trade Enforcement) the authority to take final action with respect to any petition for remission, mitigation, or cancellation of any claim (including claim for liquidated damages), fine, or penalty (including forfeiture) incurred or arising under the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, or any other law to the extent that it is administered by the U.S. Customs Service.

2. *Cancellation.* Treasury Directive 15-24, "Authority of Deputy Assistant

Secretary (Regulatory, Tariff and Trade Enforcement)," dated September 29, 1986, is superseded.

3. *Authority.* TO 101-05, "Reporting Relationships and Supervision of Officials, Offices and Bureaus, Delegation of Certain Authority, and Order of Succession in the Department of the Treasury."

4. *Office of Primary Interest.* Office of the Assistant Secretary (Enforcement).

**Peter K. Nunez,**

*Assistant Secretary (Enforcement).*

[FR Doc. 92-29166 Filed 12-1-92; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4810-25-M**