Champagne Imports, Inc. of Lansdale, Pennsylvania ("Champagne") (Registered Importer 90–009) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1983 Yamaha RD 350 motorcycles are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicle which Champagne believes is substantially similar is the 1983 Yamaha RZ 350, which was manufactured for importation into, and sale in, the United States and certified by its manufacturer, Yamaha Motor Company, as conforming to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared the 1983 Yamaha RD 350 to the 1983 Yamaha RZ 350, and found the two vehicles to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Champagne submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that the 1983 Yamaha RD 350, as originally manufactured, conforms to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as the 1983 Yamaha RZ 350, or is capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that the 1983 Yamaha RD 350 is identical to the 1983 Yamaha RZ 350 with respect to compliance with Standards Nos. 106 Brake Hoses, 111 Rearview Mirrors, 115 Vehicle Identification Number, 116 Brake Fluid, 119 New Pneumatic Tires for Vehicles other than Passenger Cars, 120 Tire Selection and Rims for Vehicles other than Passenger Cars, and 122 Motorcycle Brake Systems.

Petitioner also contends that the vehicle is capable of being readily altered to meet the following standards, in the manner indicated:

Standard No. 108 Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment: installation of U.S.- model headlamp assemblies.

Standard No. 123 *Motorcycle Controls and Displays*: installation of a U.S. model speedometer calibrated in miles per hour.

Comments should refer to the docket number and be submitted to: Docket Section, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Room 5109, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., 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 on the petition

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

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

Issued on: June 19, 1996.
Marilynne Jacobs,
Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.
[FR Doc. 96–16117 Filed 6–24–96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

[Docket No. 96-061; Notice 1]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1992 Mercedes-Benz 250D Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1992 Mercedes-Benz 250D 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 a 1992 Mercedes-Benz 250D 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 importation into and 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 July 25, 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 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.

Čhampagne Imports, Inc. of Lansdale, Pennsylvania (Registered Importer No. R-90-009) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1992 Mercedes-Benz 250D passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicle which Champagne believes is substantially similar is the 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300E. Champagne has submitted information indicating that Daimler Benz, A.G., the company that manufactured the 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300E, certified that vehicle as conforming to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards and offered it for sale in the United States.

The petitioner contends that it carefully compared the 1992 Mercedes-Benz 250D to the 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300E, and found the two models to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Champagne submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that the 1992 Mercedes-Benz 250D, as originally manufactured, conforms to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as the 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300E that was offered for sale in the United States, or is capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that the 1992 Mercedes-Benz 250D is identical to the certified 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300E 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, 207 Seating Systems, 209 Seat Belt Assemblies, 210 Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages, 211 Wheel Nuts, Wheel Discs and Hubcaps, 212 Windshield Retention, 216 Roof Crush Resistance, 219 Windshield 1992 Zone Intrusion, and 302 Flammability of Interior Materials.

Additionally, the petitioner states that the 1992 Mercedes- Benz 250D complies with the Bumper Standard found in 49 CFR Part 581.

Petitioner also contends that the vehicle is 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 a noncomplying symbol on the brake failure indicator lamp; (b) installation of a seat belt warning lamp that displays the appropriate symbol; (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 headlamp assemblies; (b) installation of U.S.-model front and rear sidemarker/reflector assemblies; (c) installation of U.S.-model taillamp assemblies; (d) installation of a high mounted stop lamp.

Standard No. 110 Tire Selection and Rims: installation of a tire information placard

Standard No. 111 Rearview Mirrors: replacement of the convex passenger side rearview mirror.

Standard No. 114 *Theft Protection*: installation of a buzzer microswitch in the steering lock assembly, and a warning buzzer.

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. 206 *Door Locks and Door Retention Components*: replacement of the rear door locks and lock buttons with U.S.-model parts.

Standard No. 208 Occupant Crash Protection: (a) Installation of a U.S.model seat belt in the driver's position, or a belt webbing-actuated microswitch inside the driver's seat belt retractor; (b) installation of an ignition switchactuated seat belt warning lamp and buzzer; (c) replacement of the driver's side air bag and knee bolster with U.S.model components. The petitioner states that the vehicle is equipped at each front designated seating position with a combination lap and shoulder restraint that adjusts by means of an automatic retractor and releases by means of a single push-button. The petitioner further states that the vehicle is equipped at both outboard rear designated seating positions with combination lap and shoulder restraints that release by means of a single pushbutton, and with a lap belt in the rear center designated seating position.

Standard No. 214 Side Impact Protection: installation of reinforcing beams.

Standard No. 301 Fuel System Integrity: installation of a rollover valve in the fuel tank vent line between the fuel tank and the evaporative emissions collection canister.

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, S.W., 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 on the petition will be published in the Federal Register pursuant to the authority indicated below.

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

Issued on: June 19, 1996.

Marilynne Jacobs,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance. [FR Doc. 96–16118 Filed 6–24–96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

[Docket No. 96-23; Notice 2]

Decision That Nonconforming 1987 Volkswagen Golf Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT. **ACTION:** Notice of decision by NHTSA that nonconforming 1987 Volkswagen Golf passenger cars are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the decision by NHTSA that 1987 Volkswagen Golf passenger cars not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are eligible for importation into the United States because they are substantially similar to a vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States and certified by its manufacturer as complying with the safety standards (the U.S.-certified version of the 1987 Volkswagen Golf), and they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: This decision is effective June 25, 1996.

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) 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