

disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than September 11, 1996.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

*Level of the proposed PFC:* \$3.00.

*Proposed charge effective date:* November 1, 1996.

*Proposed charge expiration date:* October 31, 1998.

*Total estimated PFC revenue:* \$1,518,409.

*Brief description of proposed project(s):* Reconstruction of Runway 1R/19L, Taxiway E and Air Carrier Apron (East); acquisition of a four-wheel loader, rapid intervention vehicle and a Surface Movement Guidance and Control System (SMGCS).

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Wichita Mid-Continent Airport.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on June 7, 1996.

George A. Hendon,

Manager, Airports Division Central Region.

[FR Doc. 96-15640 Filed 6-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

## National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

### Federal Highway Administration

[Docket No. 96-047-NO1]

### Study of State Costs and Benefits Associated With Repeal of the National Maximum Speed Limit (NMSL)

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** This notice invites comments, suggestions and recommendations from State highway and traffic safety officials, highway safety organizations, researchers, and others with an interest in the potential relationship between increases in the speed limit and increases in motor vehicle fatalities and injuries. Specifically, in those States that have raised their speed limits beyond that permitted by the former NMSL, this notice solicits the participation and cooperation of the respective State highway safety officials in the preparation of the study of costs

and benefits associated with the repeal of the NMSL, pursuant to Section 347 of the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995.

**DATES:** Comments are due no later than August 5, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should refer to the docket number of this notice and should be submitted to: Docket Section, NHTSA, Room 5109, Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. Docket hours are 9:30 am to 4:00 pm EST.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** In NHTSA, Delmas Johnson, National Center for Statistics and Analysis, Telephone 202/366-5382, Fax 202/366-7078, Internet address is [djohnson@nhtsa.dot.gov](mailto:djohnson@nhtsa.dot.gov). In FHWA, Suzanne Stack, Office of Highway Safety, Telephone 202/366-2620, Fax 202/366-2249, Internet address is [sjstack@intergate.dot.gov](mailto:sjstack@intergate.dot.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Speeding (exceeding the posted speed limit or driving too fast for conditions) is one of the most prevalent factors contributing to motor vehicle crashes, particularly fatal crashes. In calendar year 1994, speeding was a factor in 30 percent of all fatal crashes, and NHTSA estimates that 12,480 lives were lost in speed-related crashes. NHTSA estimates that an additional 23,000 persons sustained critical injuries, 60,000 sustained moderate injuries, and 500,000 sustained minor injuries, for a total of an estimated 583,000 persons injured in speed-related crashes in 1994. NHTSA estimates the 1994 costs of speed-related crashes to be more than \$23 billion.<sup>1</sup>

The National Maximum Speed Limit (NMSL), enacted during the Arab oil embargo of 1973 to conserve fuel, was set at 55 miles per hour (MPH). By March 1974, all States were in compliance with the NMSL. In addition to conserving fuel, the annual traffic fatality toll declined from 54,052 in 1973 to 45,196 in 1974, a drop of over 16%. As a result of the enormous safety benefits in the form of the reduction in traffic fatalities, the Congress passed Public Law (Pub. L.) 93-643, making the NMSL permanent. Public Law 93-643 also required every State to certify that the NMSL was being enforced.

In 1978, the Congress enacted the Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA), Pub. L. 95-599. The STAA required the States to submit data on the percentage of motor vehicles exceeding 55 MPH on public highways with a 55 MPH posted speed limit.

<sup>1</sup> *Traffic Safety Facts 1994: Speed*, U.S. Department of Transportation, NHTSA, National Center for Statistics and Analysis, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, DC 20590.

Following the enactment of the NMSL, numerous studies of the benefits and costs of the legislation were conducted. A joint NHTSA/FHWA task force, charged with determining the safety benefits of the NMSL, conducted one of these studies. The NHTSA/FHWA task force concluded that while the "determination of a precise, accurate estimate of lives saved by the NMSL is problematic, there were 20,000 to 30,000 lives saved by the NMSL during the period 1974-1978."<sup>2</sup>

The STAA of 1982 required that a study of the "benefits, both human and economic" of the NMSL, with "particular attention to savings to the taxpayers" be conducted by the National Academy of Sciences' Transportation Research Board (TRB). In 1984, TRB published its special report, *55: A Decade of Experience*.<sup>3</sup> The TRB study, conducted by a 19 member committee composed of experts from a wide range of disciplines needed to evaluate the costs and benefits of the NMSL, represents one of the most thorough and extensive examinations of this important safety issue. Although the TRB committee recognized the inherent difficulties associated with attempts to accurately estimate the safety, economic, and energy benefits of the NMSL, the study concluded that annually 3,000 to 5,000 fewer traffic fatalities, a savings of \$2 billion in fuel costs, a savings of \$65 million in taxpayer costs were the result of the NMSL, along with an increase of 1 billion hours in travel time. The TRB study also recognized several unresolved issues, including: the impact of noncompliance; the containment of higher speeds, if permitted, on a limited subset of roads; and whether the control of the speed limit is a state or federal responsibility.

In 1987, the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act granted the states the authority to raise the speed limit, not to exceed 65 MPH, on portions of the rural Interstate system. Thirty-eight states raised speed limits on rural Interstates to 65 MPH in 1987, and two additional states adopted the 65 MPH speed limit on rural Interstates in 1988, bringing approximately 90 percent of the 34,000 rural Interstate mileage to 65 MPH. Congress asked for an evaluation of the effects of the 65 MPH speed limit on rural Interstate traffic fatalities for the

<sup>2</sup> *The Life-Saving Benefits of the 55 MPH NMSL: Report of the NHTSA/FHWA Task Force*, U.S. Department of Transportation, DOT HS 805-559, October 1980.

<sup>3</sup> *55: A Decade of Experience*, TRB Special Report 204, National Research Council, Washington DC, 1984.

period 1987 through 1989. NHTSA published the results of this evaluation in several reports to Congress, the last of which was published in 1992,<sup>4</sup> estimating the 1990 fatality toll on rural Interstates in the 38 states with 65 MPH limits to be "30 percent greater than might have been expected" or an increase of about 500 fatalities.

#### National Highway System (NHS)

##### Designation Act

The National Highway System Designation Act (hereinafter referred to as "the NHS Act") of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-59) was signed into law on November 28, 1995. The NHS Act, among other things, established the National Highway System and eliminated the Federal mandate for the NMSL. In addition, Section 347 of the NHS Act required the Secretary of Transportation to study the impact of states' actions to raise speed limits above 55/65 MPH:

Not later than September 30, 1997, the Secretary, in cooperation with any State which raises any speed limit in such State to a level above the level permitted under section 154 of title 23, United States Code, as such section was in effect on September 15, 1995, shall prepare and submit to Congress a study of—

- (1) The costs to such State of deaths and injuries resulting from motor vehicle crashes; and
- (2) The benefits associated with the repeal of the national maximum speed limit.

Rep. James L. Oberstar, in remarks on his amendment which led to the requirement contained in Pub. L. 104-

59, elaborated on the issues that the study (hereinafter referred to as the "NHS Act study") should address—

To provide meaningful, useful information, the report should include information on the costs before the State changes its safety laws, and after. It would thus be my intent that the Secretary's report, due September 30, 1997, include information on the costs of motor vehicle crashes in the year before changes go into effect; and again a year later.

The report should include, at a minimum, the costs of acute, rehabilitative and long-term medical care, sources of reimbursement and the extent to which these sources of reimbursement and the extent to which these sources cover actual costs, and the costs to all levels of government, to employers, and others.

All States are not alike. Each State will want to know its own data, so that it can determine whether its problems are coming from alcohol-related or speed-related causes, from not wearing seatbelts and helmets, or other causes, and perhaps adjust its laws accordingly.

The report should therefore also include additional factors such as whether excess speed or alcohol were involved in the accident, whether seat belts and motorcycle helmets were used by those involved in the crash, and any other factors the Secretary may wish to add or State to know.

NHTSA and FHWA (hereinafter referred to as "the agencies") propose a strategy for meeting the legislative requirements, as stated in Section 347 of the Act, in this notice. The proposed strategy is intended to address the complexities of determining the costs and benefits of increased speed limits, while meeting the Congressional

deadline of September 30, 1997. A major aspect of the proposed strategy is an emphasis on cooperation between the agencies and the States that have increased their speed limits, as stated in the legislation, for preparation of the study. It is important that the States participate in the NHS study process, as determining the impact of increased speed limits in a particular State will necessitate that an analysis of state-specific data be conducted. In addition, the proposed strategy uses an approach similar to that used in the extensive study conducted by TRB, in order to capitalize on the thorough work done by the TRB committee to examine costs and benefits resulting from decreasing the speed limit.

##### Data Needs

The agencies have identified several major categories of data needed, as a minimum, to conduct the NHS Act study. These data are critical to studying, to a reasonable degree, the issues related to determining the costs and benefits of increasing speed limits. The following table presents the minimum data requirements for addressing key components of estimating the safety impact of increasing speed limits. It will be important to collect the data described in the following table for a minimum time period of one year before the speed limit change vs. one year after the speed limit change, if at all possible.

MINIMUM DATA REQUIREMENTS FOR CONDUCTING NHS ACT STUDY

Purpose	Data description	Performing organization
Background .....	Effective Dates of Change in Limits, Roadway Types, New Limit(s), Types of Vehicles Covered.	States.
Determining the Impact of Increased Speed Limits on Traffic Fatalities.	Fatalities—Fatal Accident Reporting System (FARS)	States—state impacts. NHTSA—national impacts.
Determining the Impact of Increased Speed Limits on Injuries.	Injury Crashes and Injured Persons—by road, vehicle types, by speed limit, alcohol involvement, helmet use.	States.
Determining the Impact of Increased Speed Limits on Crashes.	Crashes of All Severities—by road, vehicle types, by speed limit, alcohol involvement, helmet use.	States.
Estimating Benefits .....	Reduced Travel Time—Commercial & Public Transportation.	States.
Estimating Costs .....	Economic Cost of Crashes—Before Vs. After Speed Limit Changes, Medical Costs of Crash-Involved Persons.	States—state impacts. NHTSA—national impacts.
Determining Exposure .....	Vehicle Miles Traveled and Speed Distribution .....	States/FHWA.

The agencies request comments from the States and other interested highway safety officials on the proposed data shown above. Specifically, the agencies request comments regarding data availability specific to relevant time

periods, data accuracy, suggestions for additional data not mentioned above, and any problems inherent in collecting and/or reporting these data.

##### Proposed NHS Study Outline

The agencies propose the following outline for the NHS study content. The proposed outline presents a structure for addressing the entire range of issues identified in Section 347 of the Act. The

<sup>4</sup> Effects of the 65 MPH Speed Limit through 1990: A Report to Congress, U.S. Department of

Transportation, NHTSA, Washington, DC, May 1992.

outline is an adaptation of the structure of the TRB special report, 55: *A Decade of Experience*. While the data described in the table shown in the previous section, Data Needs, represents the minimum data requirement for conducting the study, the following outline presents an approach for a thorough treatment of the entire range of issues associated with estimating costs and benefits of increased speed limits. The agencies recognize that data may not be available for all of these areas, but in the interest of completeness and to closely follow the TRB report's content, these areas are included. In some instances, collection of specific data may not be possible. However, estimates may be available from past relationships and/or research, or applying some type of multiplicative factors derived from other data sources.

#### Draft Outline for NHS Study

- I. Introduction
  - A. Scope of the study/legislative language
  - B. Legislative history of NMSL and requirements
  - C. Summary of previous experiences
    1. Safety
    2. Economic
- II. Effects on Travel and Vehicle Speeds
  - A. The highway system: mileage, travel and safety
  - B. Amount of travel affected
  - C. Speed and travel changes across highway systems
  - D. Adequacy of speed data for addressing issues
- III. Impacts of Increased Speed Limits
  - A. Travel Time (Personal, work, etc.)
  - B. Required Monitoring & Compliance
  - C. Fuel Consumption
  - D. Highway Safety (Fatalities, Injuries, Property Damage, etc.)
- IV. Economic Impacts of Increased Speed Limits
  - A. Value of the Effects on Travel Time
  - B. Required Monitoring & Compliance Certification Costs
  - C. Costs Associated with Fuel Consumption
  - D. Motor Vehicle Crash Costs (Medical Care, Lost Productivity, Property Damage, etc.)
- V. Summary and Conclusions

The material outlined above poses a number of challenges to assessing the impacts of raised speed limits. First and foremost is the collection of appropriate data to address the safety and economic impacts. The crash data collection should be straightforward, although the timing and availability of a sufficient amount of data to meet the report's current deadline may prove to be one of the biggest challenges. Another challenge will be in the area of analyzing the data to provide estimates of effect.

The TRB's report, 55: *A Decade of Experience*, is essentially a review of the

existing literature on these subjects, supplemented by what appears to be some new analysis at the national level, based on existing studies. The report contains hundreds of references of papers reviewed for consideration in their report. A copy of the TRB report has been placed in the docket.<sup>5</sup> The report describes methods used to estimate various components such as taxpayer costs and benefits, energy savings, and travel time. In many cases, external information was used (such as the Nationwide Personal Transportation Study) to estimate, on a national level, the amount of travel accounted for by work-related trips, and their average trip length. In some instances, changes proportional to the changes in crashes, injuries and fatalities were assumed.

As stated earlier, one of the objectives of the current report is to study the effect of raised speed limits on, " \* \* \* the costs of acute, rehabilitative and long-term medical care, sources of reimbursement and the extent to which these sources of reimbursement cover actual costs, and the costs to all levels of government, to employers, and others." This level of detail generally has been unavailable to the traffic safety community, with the possible exception of special, small-scale studies. However, NHTSA recently completed a project, *Crash Outcome Data Evaluation Study* (CODES), that consisted of grants to seven states. The CODES study employed methods whereby statewide data from police crash reports, emergency medical services, hospital emergency departments, hospital discharge files, claims and other sources were linked so that those people injured in motor vehicle crashes could be followed through the health care system. A copy of the Report to Congress (DOT-HS-808-347, February 1996) and the CODES Technical Report (DOT-HS-808-338, January 1996) have been placed in the docket. Based upon the CODES experience, NHTSA continues to encourage states to link these data as a resource for identifying and quantifying traffic safety problems within states, and for evaluating the health-care consequences of various traffic safety policy decisions. In the absence of such linked databases within the states, other approaches to estimating the economic effects on the health-care system will need to be employed.

Lastly, NHTSA's last Report to Congress on the *Effects of the 65 mph*

*Speed Limit Through 1990* (DOT-HS-807-840, June 1992) has been placed in the docket. This report illustrates the type of analysis of crash data that can be performed for estimating the effect of speed limit changes. In this report, a time series regression model was used to estimate the data, using annual data from 1975 through 1986 as the baseline period, and 1987 through 1990 as the 65 mph period. Fatalities on rural interstate highways in the 38 states that increased their speed limits in 1987 were modeled as a function of fatalities on all other roads in these 38 states, and a dummy (0,1) variable representing the absence/presence of the 65 mph speed limit. This approach resulted in a model that fit the data well (i.e., 88 percent of the variation explained). In general, a longer time frame permits more stable estimates than simply comparing the year before vs. the year after, and thus, would be preferable for the current report.

Based on the above outline, the proposed NHS study would attempt to address a wide range of issues on the benefits and costs of the increased speed limits, using a compilation of State-specific data and national estimates. Chapter I—Introduction, would present an overview of the historical background on establishing speed limits, specifically the NMSL, and a brief summary of findings from study of the costs and benefits of the NMSL, similar to the material presented earlier in this notice in Supplementary Information. Chapter II—Effects on Travel and Vehicle Speeds, would rely heavily on information received from the States with increased speed limits, augmented by anecdotal information on the national impact. Chapter III—Impacts of Increased Speed Limits, would present a detailed assessment, using data collected and analyzed by individual States, on the estimated savings in reduced travel time and monitoring/compliance efforts and the estimated impact in terms of increases in motor vehicle crashes, fatalities, injuries, traffic congestion, and fuel consumption. As such, Chapter III encompasses a critical portion of the proposed study and will necessitate that the agencies rely upon the individual States for detailed assessments of the impact of increased speed limits on crashes, particularly injury and property damage crashes, traffic congestion, reduced air quality, and increased fuel consumption. It will be extremely important to receive State information on these key areas for compiling the NHS study, as the agencies will not have direct access to State specific data

<sup>5</sup> Interested parties may request a copy by contacting the TRB, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20418.

on these issues. Chapter IV—Economic Impacts of Increased Speed Limits—would present an examination of the actual costs saved in reduction in travel time and the costs incurred as a result of increases in the crash spectrum, fatalities, injuries, and property damage, in detail. As a result, Chapter IV extends the analysis of the data presented in Chapter III by supplementing estimates of increases in motor vehicle crashes, with the economic cost of various components of crash costs. The agencies

plan to rely heavily on the State analyses for compiling Chapter IV and intends to augment, as necessary, the State findings with economic cost estimates and a presentation of national estimates of economic costs, as well. Most importantly, the agencies will have to rely exclusively on State specific information for compiling one particular component of Chapter IV, Section D—Impact on public revenues. Chapter V—Summary and Conclusions—would present a summary

of the State and National findings from previous chapters, along with observations regarding difficulties encountered by the States and the agencies in the analytical process and general conclusions.

#### Proposed Schedule

The agencies propose the following schedule for completing the NHS study in order to meet the deadline established by Section 347 of the Act.

#### PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR CONDUCTING NHS STUDY

Date	Milestone
August 5, 1996 .....	End 45-day comment period w/comments due to NHTSA/FHWA.
September 27, 1996 .....	Publish final notice on NHS Act study methodology and summary of comments received.
October 1996 thru April 1997	Provide technical support to the States on an "as requested" basis for preparing State-specific studies of the costs/benefits of increased speed limits.
May 30, 1997 .....	States' individual studies on costs/benefits of increased speed limits are due to NHTSA/FHWA.
June 30, 1997 .....	NHTSA/FHWA complete draft NHS Act study report including consolidation of individual State studies.
July 1997 .....	Draft NHS study circulated for review within DOT and to participating States.
August 1997 .....	Final NHS study completed and reviewed/approved by DOT.
September 30, 1997 .....	NHS study sent to Congress.

#### Issues Regarding Data Availability, Proposed NHS Act Study Outline, and Schedule

The agencies recognize that the proposed NHS study outline, while comprehensive in addressing the various aspects of determining the benefits and costs of increased speed limits, may present difficulties, based on the timing of the schedule, particularly in terms of data availability. Data availability is a key concern for completing the proposed study at the Federal and State levels. For example, while NHTSA maintains data on traffic fatalities and fatal crashes for the nation in the Fatal Accident Reporting System (FARS), FARS data for 1996 will be available for analysis in June 1997, three months from the legislative due date for the NHS Act study. Additionally, 1996 data on vehicle miles traveled, a critical measure of exposure needed for fatality and injury rate calculations, will be not available to FHWA until September 1997, at the same time the NHS Act study is due to Congress. As a result, the agencies solicit comments on these proposed requirements, and are particularly interested in answers to the following questions:

1. In the States with increased speed limits, are there data available in the State to address the specific areas outlined in the proposed NHS Act study, especially Chapter III—Impacts of Increased Speed Limits and Chapter IV—Economic Impacts of Increased Speed Limits? If so, to what extent?

2. Do plans currently exist within the State(s) to study the impact—safety and economic—of increased speed limits? If yes, does the State anticipate meeting the proposed schedule for forwarding results of the study to DOT? If there are no current plans to study the impact of increased speed limits, does the State intend to participate in the proposed study effort by contributing information regarding the changes in the State related to increased speed limits?

3. Is the proposed approach reasonable? Are there issues that should be studied that are not included in the proposed outline? Are there issues included in the proposed outline that should be omitted or revised?

4. Is the proposed schedule reasonable? If not, what can reasonably be accomplished within the proposed time frame? What is an alternative schedule that would be more reasonable?

5. Does the proposed schedule provide for a sufficient period of time to evaluate the effects of increased speed limits? For example, the study is tasked with comparing one year before vs. one year after the change in speed limits. States are asked to comment on the timing of their implemented or planned changes in the State speed limit as it relates to the NHS Act study objectives.

The agencies invite public comment on the above questions and other areas of this notice. Interested individuals, highway safety organizations, State highway officials, and others are encouraged to submit comments on these and any related issues. It is

requested (but not required) that ten (10) copies of each comment be submitted. Written comments to the docket must be received on or before August 5, 1996. In order to expedite review of this notice and the submission of comments, copies of this notice are being sent simultaneously with issuance to members of the National Association of Governors' Highway Safety Representatives (NAGHSR) and the American Association of State Highway Safety and Traffic Officials (AASHTO). Comments should not exceed fifteen (15) pages in length. Necessary attachments may be appended to the submissions without regard to the fifteen page limit. This limitation is intended to encourage commenters to detail their primary concerns in a concise manner. All comments received before the close of business on the comment closing date listed above will be considered and will be available for examination in the docket room at the above address both before and after that date. To the extent possible, comments filed after the closing date will be considered. Those commenters wishing to be notified upon receipt of their comments by the Docket should include a self-addressed, stamped envelope with their comments. Upon receipt of the comments, the Docket supervisor will return the postcard by U.S. Mail.

Issued: June 14, 1996.

Signed:

Donald C. Bischoff,  
Acting Executive Director, National Highway  
Traffic Safety Administration.

Anthony R. Kane,  
Executive Director, Federal Highway  
Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-15599 Filed 6-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

**[Docket No. 96-064; Notice 1]**

**Notice of Receipt of Petition for  
Decision That Nonconforming 1993,  
1995, and 1996 Porsche Carrera 2-Door  
Passenger Cars are Eligible for  
Importation**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of receipt of petition for  
decision that nonconforming 1993,  
1995, and 1996 Porsche Carrera 2-door  
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 1993, 1995, and 1996  
Porsche Carrera 2-door passenger cars  
that were not originally manufactured to  
comply with all applicable Federal  
motor vehicle safety standards are  
eligible for importation into the United  
States because (1) they are substantially  
similar to vehicles that were originally  
manufactured for importation into and  
sale in the United States and that were  
certified by their manufacturer as  
complying with the safety standards, and  
(2) they are capable of being readily  
altered to conform to the standards.

**DATES:** The closing date for comments  
on the petition is July 19, 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 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 (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.

G&K Automotive Conversion, Inc. of  
Santa Ana, California ("G&K")  
(Registered Importer 90-007) has  
petitioned NHTSA to decide whether  
1993, 1995, and 1996 Porsche Carrera 2-  
door passenger cars are eligible for  
importation into the United States. The  
vehicles which G&K believes are  
substantially similar are the 1993, 1995,  
and 1996 Porsche Carrera 2-door  
passenger cars that were manufactured  
for importation into, and sale in, the  
United States and certified by their  
manufacturer as conforming to all  
applicable Federal motor vehicle safety  
standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully  
compared the non-U.S. certified 1993,  
1995, and 1996 Porsche Carrera 2-door  
passenger cars to their U.S. certified  
counterparts, and found the vehicles to  
be substantially similar with respect to  
compliance with most Federal motor  
vehicle safety standards.

G&K submitted information with its  
petition intended to demonstrate that  
the non-U.S. certified 1993, 1995, and  
1996 Porsche Carrera 2-door passenger  
cars, as originally manufactured,  
conform to many Federal motor vehicle  
safety standards 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  
the non-U.S. certified 1993, 1995, and  
1996 Porsche Carrera 2-door passenger  
cars are identical to their U.S. certified  
counterparts 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*, 203 *Impact  
Protection for the Driver From the  
Steering Control System*, 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  
Anchorage*, 211 *Wheel Nuts*, *Wheel  
Discs and Hubcaps*, 212 *Windshield  
Retention*, 216 *Roof Crush Resistance*,  
219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion*, and 302  
*Flammability of Interior Materials*.

Petitioner also contends that the  
vehicles are 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) placement of a seat belt  
warning symbol on the 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 headlamps  
and front sidemarkers; (b) installation of  
U.S.-model taillamp lenses which  
incorporate rear sidemarkers; (c)  
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*: installation of a seat belt  
warning buzzer. The petitioner states  
that the vehicle is equipped with  
driver's and passenger's side air bags