

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for transportation improvements in the Greenbush Corridor linking the coastal communities of Braintree, Weymouth, Hingham, Cohasset, and Scituate, Massachusetts. The project sponsor, the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA), has announced its intention not to seek Federal financial assistance from FTA in constructing improvements in the Greenbush Corridor.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Richard H. Doyle, Regional Administrator, Federal Transit Administration, Region 1, Telephone (617) 494-2055.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On October 5, 1992, FTA published a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS for transportation improvements in the Greenbush Corridor linking the coastal communities of Braintree, Weymouth, Hingham, Cohasset, and Scituate, Massachusetts (57 FR 45864). In March 1995, FTA and the MBTA released a Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS), and published a Notice of Availability of that SDEIS on March 24, 1995 (60 FR 15565). In January 1996, however, the MBTA notified FTA that it will not seek Federal funding for transportation improvements in the Greenbush Corridor; rather, the MBTA has chosen to finance the entirety of its project with state funds. Thus, there is no longer a proposal for Federal action in the Greenbush Corridor subject to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, nor an FTA-assisted project subject to the requirements of 49 U.S.C. Section 303 ("Section 4(f)" of the Department of Transportation Act). Accordingly, FTA is terminating its preparation of an EIS for the Greenbush Corridor.

Issued on: February 15, 1996.

Richard H. Doyle,

*Regional Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 96-3896 Filed 2-20-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-57-P

## National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 96-14; Notice 1]

### Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1992 Through 1996 Mercedes-Benz Type 463 Long Wheel Base V-8 Gelaendewagen Multi-Purpose Passenger Vehicles Are Eligible for Importation

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

**ACTION:** Request for comments on petition for decision that nonconforming 1992 through 1996 Mercedes-Benz Type 463 Long Wheel Base V-8 Gelaendewagen multi-purpose passenger vehicles (MPVs) are eligible for importation.

**SUMMARY:** This notice requests comments on a petition submitted to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) for a decision that 1992 through 1996 Mercedes-Benz Type 463 Long Wheel Base V-8 Gelaendewagen MPVs that were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are eligible for importation into the United States because they have safety features that comply with, or are capable of being altered to comply with, all such standards.

**DATES:** The closing date for comments on the petition is March 22, 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 109(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. Where there is no substantially similar U.S.-certified motor vehicle, 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(B) (formerly section 108(c)(3)(A)(i)(II) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. 1397(c)(3)(A)(i)(II)) permits a nonconforming motor vehicle to be admitted into the United States if its safety features comply with, or are capable of being altered to comply with, all applicable Federal motor vehicle

safety standards based on destructive test data or such other evidence as NHTSA decides to be adequate.

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.

Europa International, Inc. of Santa Fe, New Mexico (Registered Importer No. R-91-002) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1992 through 1996 Mercedes-Benz Type 463 Long Wheel Base V-8 Gelaendewagen MPVs are eligible for importation into the United States. Europa contends that these vehicles are eligible for importation under 49 U.S.C. § 30141(a)(1)(B) because they have safety features that comply with, or are capable of being altered to comply with, all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that 1992 through 1996 Mercedes-Benz Type 463 Long Wheel Base V-8 Gelaendewagen MPVs have safety features that comply with Standard Nos. 102 *Transmission Shift Lever Sequence* \* \* \* (based on visual inspection and operation), 103 *Defrosting and Defogging Systems* (based on inspection), 104 *Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems* (based on operation), 106 *Brake Hoses* (based on visual inspection of certification markings), 107 *Reflecting Surfaces* (based on visual inspection), 113 *Hood Latch Systems* (based on information in owner's manual describing operation of secondary latch mechanism), 116 *Brake Fluids* (based on visual inspection of certification markings and information in owner's manual describing fluids installed at factory), 119 *New Pneumatic Tires for Vehicles other than Passenger Cars* (based on visual inspection of certification markings), 124 *Accelerator Control Systems* (based on operation and comparison to U.S.-certified vehicles), 201 *Occupant Protection in Interior Impact* (based on test data and certification of vehicle to European standard), 202 *Head Restraints* (based on Standard No. 208 test data for 1993 model year vehicle with same head restraint and certification of vehicle to European standard), 204 *Steering Control Rearward Displacement* (based

on test film), 205 *Glazing Materials* (based on visual inspection of certification markings), 207 *Seating Systems*, (based on test results and certification of vehicle to European standard), 209 *Seat Belt Assemblies* (based on wiring diagram of seat belt warning system and visual inspection of certification markings), 211 *Wheel Nuts, Wheel Discs and Hubcaps* (based on visual inspection), 214 *Side Impact Protection* (based on test results for identically equipped 1995 model year vehicle), 219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion* (based on test results and certification information for identically equipped 1993 model year vehicle), and 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials* (based on composition of upholstery).

The petitioner also contends that 1992 through 1996 Mercedes-Benz Type 463 Long Wheel Base V-8 Gelaen MPVs are capable of being altered to comply with 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 speedometer/odometer calibrated in miles per hour.

Standard No. 105 *Hydraulic Brake Systems*: Placement of warning label on brake fluid reservoir cap.

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment*: (a) Installation of U.S.-model sealed beam headlamps; (b) installation of U.S.-model side marker lamps and reflectors; (c) installation of a high mounted stop lamp on vehicles manufactured after September 1, 1993. The petitioner asserts that testing performed on the taillamp reveals that it complies with the standard, even though it lacks a DOT certification marking, and that all other lights are DOT certified.

Standard No. 111 *Rearview Mirrors*: Inscription of the required warning statement on the convex surface of the passenger side rearview mirror.

Standard No. 114 *Theft Protection*: Installation of a warning buzzer in the steering lock electrical circuit.

Standard No. 115 *Vehicle Identification Number*: Installation of a VIN plate that can be read from outside the left windshield pillar.

Standard No. 118 *Power-Operated Window Systems*: Rewiring of the power window system so that the window transport is inoperative when the front doors are open.

Standard No. 120 *Tire Selection and Rims for Vehicles other than Passenger Cars*: Installation of a tire information placard. The petitioner asserts that even though the tire rims lack a DOT certification marking, they comply with

the standard, based on their manufacturer's certification that they comply with the German TUV regulations, as well as their certification by the British Standard Association and the Rim Association of Australia.

Standard No. 206 *Door Locks and Door Retention Components*: Installation of interior locking buttons on all door locks and modification of rear door locks to disable latch release controls when locking mechanism is engaged.

Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*: Installation of a complying driver's side air bag and a seat belt warning system. The petitioner asserts that the vehicle conforms to the standard's injury criteria at the front passenger position based on a test report from the vehicle's manufacturer. The petitioner additionally submitted a letter from an engineering concern stating that in frontal impact tests, a vehicle equipped with a V-8 engine will yield driver and passenger HIC measurements that are equivalent to, or better than those of a vehicle equipped with a 6 cylinder engine. The letter attributes this primarily to the fact that a V-8 engine block is six inches shorter than a 6 cylinder engine block, providing a greater crush-zone and therefore a less severe crash pulse. The petitioner states that it intends to meet automatic restraint phase-in requirements for vehicles manufactured after September 1, 1995 by importing other vehicles equipped with passenger-side automatic restraints.

Standard No. 210 *Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages*: Insertion of instructions on the installation and use of child restraints in the owner's manual for the vehicle. The petitioner asserts that the vehicle is certified as complying with a European standard that contains more severe force application requirements than those of this standard.

Standard No. 212 *Windshield Retention*: Application of cement to the windshield's edges.

Standard No. 301 *Fuel System Integrity*: Installation of a rollover valve.

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 will be published in the Federal Register pursuant to the authority indicated below.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. § 30141(a)(1)(B) and (b)(1); 49 CFR 593.8; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on: February 14, 1996.

Marilynne Jacobs,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 96-3811 Filed 2-20-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-M

#### [Docket No. 96-13; Notice 1]

#### Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1972 Ford Mustang Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

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

**ACTION:** Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1972 Ford Mustang passenger cars manufactured for the Mexican market 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 1972 Ford Mustang manufactured for the Mexican market 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 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 March 22, 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 a.m. to 4 p.m.]

**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