

management and recreation use restrictions are needed to prevent conflicts between users and unacceptable impacts on resource values, while continuing to provide a variety of recreational opportunities.

Notice of these regulations will be posted on-the-ground at the entrance to the Black Ridge Road network, at the beginning of the cherry stemm road to the arches, at the Rattlesnake Arches, Devils Canyon and Pollock Bench Trailheads, at the Loma Boat Launch, at the main staging area in Rabbit Valley, and at the Grand Junction Resource Area office.

Persons who may be exempted from the restrictions include: (a) Any federal, state, or local officers engaged in fire, emergency and law enforcement activities; (b) BLM employees engaged on official duties; (c) other persons authorized to operate motorized vehicles within the restricted areas.

**PENALTIES:** Violations of this restriction order are punishable by fines not to exceed \$100,000 and/or imprisonment not to exceed 12 months.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Catherine Robertson, Area Manager, Grand Junction Resource Area, 2815 H Road Grand Junction, Colorado 81506; (303) 244-3000. Mark Morse, District Manager, Grand Junction District, 2815 H Road, Grand Junction, Colorado 81506; (970) 244-3000.

**Rich Arcand,**

*Grand Junction Acting District Manager.*

[FR Doc. 98-24439 Filed 9-10-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-JB-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[ID-957-1430-00]

#### Idaho: Filing of Plats of Survey; Idaho

The plat of the following described land was officially filed in the Idaho State Office, Bureau of Land Management, Boise, Idaho, effective 9:00 a.m., August 31, 1998.

The plat representing the dependent resurvey of portions of the south and east boundaries and portions of the subdivisional lines, and the subdivision of sections 25, 26, 35, and 36, the survey of certain lots, and certain metes-and-bounds surveys in T. 4 S., R. 19 E., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group 985, was accepted August 31, 1998. This survey was executed to meet certain administrative needs of the Bureau of Land Management.

All inquiries concerning the surveys of the above described land must be sent

to the Chief, Cadastral Survey, Idaho State Office, Bureau of Land Management, 1387 South Vinnell Way, Boise, Idaho, 83709-1657.

Dated: August 31, 1998.

**Duane E. Olsen,**

*Chief Cadastral Surveyor for Idaho.*

[FR Doc. 98-24429 Filed 9-10-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-GG-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[ID-957-1150-00]

#### Idaho: Filing of Plats of Survey; Idaho

The plats of the following described land was officially filed in the Idaho State Office, Bureau of Land Management, Boise, Idaho, effective 9:00 a.m., August 31, 1998. The plat representing the dependent resurvey of a portion of the subdivisional lines, and the subdivision of section 4, and the survey of lots 8 and 12 in section 4 and lot 5 in section 5, T. 17 N., R. 24 E., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group 988, was accepted August 31, 1998. This survey was executed to meet certain administrative needs of the bureau of Land Management. The plat representing the dependent resurvey of portions of the Fourth Standard Parallel North, the south boundary of the Lemhi Indian Reservation, and subdivided lines, and the subdivision of certain sections, T. 18 N., R. 24 E., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group 988, was accepted August 31, 1998. This survey was executed to meet certain administrative needs of the Bureau of Land Management. All inquiries concerning the survey of the above described land must be sent to the Chief, Cadastral Survey, Idaho State Office, Bureau of Land Management, 1387 South Vinnell Way, Boise, Idaho, 83709-1657.

Dated: August 31, 1998.

**Duane E. Olsen,**

*Chief Cadastral Surveyor for Idaho.*

[FR Doc. 98-24430 Filed 9-10-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-GG-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[ID-957-1030-00]

#### Idaho: Filing of Plats of Survey; Idaho

The field notes of the following described land were officially filed in the Idaho State Office, Bureau of Land

Management, Boise, Idaho, effective 9:00 a.m., September 4, 1998.

The field notes representing the remonumentation of certain original corners in Tps. 18 and 19 N., R. 22 E., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group 1000, were accepted September 4, 1998. This remonumentation was executed to meet certain administrative needs of the Bureau of Land Management.

The field notes representing the remonumentation of certain original corners in T. 24 N., R. 3 E., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group 1000, were accepted September 4, 1998. This remonumentation was executed to meet certain administrative needs of the Bureau of Land Management.

All inquiries concerning the survey of the above described land must be sent to the Chief, Cadastral Survey, Idaho State Office, Bureau of Land Management, 1387 South Vinnell Way, Boise, Idaho, 83709-1657.

Dated: September 4, 1998.

**Duane E. Olsen,**

*Chief Cadastral Surveyor for Idaho.*

[FR Doc. 98-24438 Filed 9-10-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-GG-M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Auto Theft and Recovery; Request for Comments

**AGENCY:** Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Anti Car Theft Act of 1992 ("ACTA"), as amended, requires the Secretary of the Department of Transportation to expand the scope of its existing automobile parts marketing program to include certain unmarked passenger motor vehicles—*unless* the Attorney General finds that such a program would not substantially inhibit chop shop operations and motor vehicle thefts. In accordance with the requirement of section 306 of ACTA, the Attorney General is required to make this finding based, in part, on information developed after notice and an opportunity for a public hearing. Therefore, the United States Department of Justice is publishing this notice seeking public comment on the issue of whether or not parts marking substantially inhibits chop shop operations and motor vehicle thefts.

**DATES:** All comments must be received no later than November 10, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** All comments should be submitted to Thomas Eldridge, U.S. Department of Justice, Room 2213, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20530.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Thomas Eldridge, U.S. Department of Justice, Room 2213, Washington D.C. 20530 (202) 307-3966.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Motor Vehicle Theft Law Enforcement Act of 1984 (the "1984 Act") required the Secretary of the Department of Transportation ("DOT") to issue a rule requiring the marking of certain major parts of high-theft passenger automobile lines. DOT implemented the 1984 Act by issuing the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard, as codified at 49 CFR Part 541.

The purpose of the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard was to reduce the incidence of motor vehicle theft by facilitating the tracing and recovery of parts from stolen vehicles. The standard seeks to facilitate such tracing by requiring that vehicle identification numbers ("VINs"), VIN derivative numbers, or other symbols be placed on major motor vehicle parts. At this time, each vehicle in a high-theft line must have its major parts and major replacement parts marked unless the line is exempted from parts marking pursuant to 49 CFR part 543.

The Anti Car theft Act of 1992 ("ACTA") expanded the coverage of the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard to include high theft lines of multipurpose passenger vehicles or light duty trucks rated less than 6,000 pounds gross vehicle weight. ACTA also required DOT to prescribe a vehicle theft standard to cover not more than 50 percent of passenger motor vehicles (except light duty trucks) not designated as high theft lines. DOT was required to prescribe such conforming vehicle theft standards by October 25, 1994. In addition, ACTA required the Secretary of DOT to apply the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard to all remaining lines of passenger motor vehicles (except light duty trucks) within three years after prescribing the vehicle theft standard—*unless* the Attorney General found that applying the standard would not substantially inhibit chop shop operations and motor vehicle thefts.

The Attorney General is required to make this finding based, in part, on information developed after notice and an opportunity for a public hearing. Therefore, the Department of Justice now seeks public comment on whether or not applying the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard to the remaining lines of passenger motor vehicles (except light duty trucks) substantially inhibits chop shop operations and motor vehicle thefts.

The Attorney General also is required to consider and include in a record

submitted to the Secretary of DOT additional costs, effectiveness, competition, and available alternative factors concerning the expansion of the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard. The Department of Justice will consider studies conducted by the Department and DOT, as well as any comments solicited by this notice, in reaching its finding. The Department of Justice also will consider comments previously submitted to DOT in response to a June 26, 1997 **Federal Register** Notice (62 FR 34494) requesting comments on a DOT preliminary report entitled "Auto Theft and Recovery; Preliminary Report on the Effects of the Anti Car Theft Act of 1992 and the Motor Vehicle Theft Law Enforcement Act of 1984." Parties who submitted comments to DOT in response to that request do not need to submit similar comments to the Department of Justice.

In order to develop the required information for its finding, the Department of Justice awarded a grant, through a competitive process, to a contractor to evaluate the impact of the auto parts marking regulations on automobile thefts. As part of this grant, the contractor surveyed auto theft investigators from local and state law enforcement agencies. This survey, titled "Opinions of 47 Auto Theft Investigators Regarding Automobile Component Parts Anti-Theft Labels," was prepared and submitted to the Department of Justice for consideration on December 30, 1996. The following outlines the findings contained in the survey:

(1) The survey was administered by telephone to a sample of investigators from 47 jurisdictions, including 31 of the 32 largest cities in the country (plus Miami), six smaller jurisdictions, and nine state agencies.

(2) Nearly three-quarters of the 40 big city and state auto theft investigators contacted reported that anti-theft labels are useful in helping to identify and arrest chop shop owners and individuals who steal or traffic in stolen vehicles and parts.

(3) Nearly two-thirds of investigators reported that labels also aid in the successful prosecution of chop shop operators and other automobile and parts thieves.

(4) Investigators reported that the most serious obstacle to making more effective use of the labels is that they are easily removed and, once removed, it is impossible to prove that the parts are stolen because the owner cannot be traced.

(5) Investigators were about evenly divided regarding whether anti-theft

labels deter professionals or amateurs from stealing or stripping cars.

(6) All but one investigator felt that parts marking legislation should be extended to all automobile lines and to all types of noncommercial vehicles, especially pickup trucks.

(7) Investigators suggested that parts marking might be more effective if: (i) auto theft investigators and patrol officers were trained more systematically and frequently in how to investigate label removal and tampering; (ii) legislation in every state made tampering with or removing labels a felony; and (iii) manufacturers were required to stamp VINs on the component parts rather than using removable labels.

(8) Respondents also recommended providing investigators access to ultraviolet lights with which to detect counterfeit labels or the "footprints" that most anti-theft labels are designed to leave if removed.

The Department of Justice plans to consider this survey prior to making and providing its required finding to DOT. Persons interested in obtaining a copy of the survey should call the National Criminal Justice Reference Service at 1-(800) 851-3420 and request Document No. NCJ 171693.

Pursuant to the grant awarded by the Department of Justice, the contractor also is preparing a report based on a cross-sectional time series analysis of national auto theft data, including FBI reported automobile thefts, R.J. Polk, Inc.'s data on car registrations, supplemented by Census statistics, FBI Uniform Crime Reports, and the National Household Victimization Survey. This report currently is being revised to incorporate new information provided by DOT and should be completed no later than the end of 1998. The Department of Justice plans to consider this report prior to making and providing its required finding to DOT.

In addition to the report being prepared on behalf of the Department of Justice, DOT also conducted studies addressing the effectiveness of parts marking which the Department of Justice will consider as part of the record for its findings. In 1991, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration presented a report to Congress assessing the auto theft problem in the United States and evaluating parts marking. Although evidence of the effectiveness of parts marking could not be obtained through statistical analysis of theft and recovery rates at that time, DOT nevertheless found wide support in 1991 for parts marking in the law enforcement community. Investigators believed that

parts marking provided them with a valuable tool for detecting, apprehending, and prosecuting thieves. After considering the analyses, surveys and public comments obtained during the preparation of the 1991 report, DOT recommended that the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard be continued with minor changes.

In addition, on June 26, 1997, DOT sought information concerning the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard in a **Federal Register** Notice (62 FR 34494) requesting comments on a DOT preliminary report entitled "Auto Theft and Recovery; Preliminary Report on the Effects of the Anti Car Theft Act of 1992 and the Motor Vehicle Theft Law Enforcement Act of 1984." Persons interested in obtaining a copy of this report should contact the Docket Section, Room 5111, NASSIF Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590, and refer to Docket Number 97-042; Notice 1.

According to DOT's June 26, 1997 notice, analyses of the effectiveness of parts marking in "high theft" passenger car lines suggested that parts marking has benefits in reducing theft rates, and at times in increasing recovery rates. DOT stated that these benefits seem to exceed the cost of parts marking. DOT also found that the greatest impact of parts marking appears to occur with chop shops and "professional" auto thieves. While more vehicles stolen for export are being recovered according to DOT, the number recovered was too small to say that parts marking has helped reduce thefts for export or recovery of these vehicles. (62 FR 34496).

Given that parts marking appears to be effective in currently marked passenger car lines, DOT believed that there was no reason to doubt that it also could have benefits for other passenger vehicles. DOT further stated that it appears that parts marking and other provisions of the 1984 Act and ACTA have given the law enforcement community tools they can use to deter thefts, trace stolen vehicles and parts, and apprehend and convict thieves. (62 FR 34496-97).

The Department of Justice plans to utilize these reports and studies, as well as any comments solicited by this notice or the DOT notice, as the record for the finding it will make to the Secretary of DOT pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 33103(c).

#### Comments Sought

The Department of Justice seeks public comment on whether or not applying the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard to the remaining lines of passenger motor

vehicles (except light duty trucks) substantially inhibits chop shop operations and motor vehicle thefts. In this regard, the Department of Justice also seeks comments concerning additional costs, effectiveness, competition, and available alternative factors associated with the expansion of the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard to the remaining lines of passenger motor vehicles (except light duty trucks).

All comments received before the close of business on the comment closing date will be considered. To the extent possible, comments filed after the closing date also will be considered.

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 33103.

Dated: August 25, 1998.

**James K. Robinson,**

*Assistant Attorney General.*

[FR Doc. 98-24434 Filed 9-10-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-14-M

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

##### Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act

In accordance with Departmental policy, 28 CFR § 50.7, and Section 122 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9622, notice is hereby given that on July 31, 1998, a proposed Consent Decree in *United States v. Crestwood Development et al.*, Civ. Action No. 98-73313 was lodged with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan. This Consent Decree represents a settlement of claims of the United States against: (1) Crestwood Development Company; (2) Ford Motor Company; (3) Indian Head Industries, Inc. (f.k.a Detroit Gasket & Manufacturing Company); (4) John Denski; (5) Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Company; (6) Purolator Products Company; (7) Stanley Denski; (8) TBG Services, Inc.; (9) TPI Petroleum, Inc. (f.k.a. J. Austin Oil); (10) Woolf Aircraft Products; (11) Charter Township of Canton; (12) City of Allen Park; (13) City of Garden City; (14) City of Inkster; (15) City of Livonia; (16) City of Plymouth; (17) City of Romulus; (18) City of Wayne; (19) City of Westland; and (20) County of Wayne (collectively "Settling Defendants"), for reimbursement of response costs in connection with the Nankin Township Superfund Site ("Site") pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.

Under this settlement with the United States, Settling Defendants, will pay \$1,573,551.76, plus interest, in

reimbursement of response costs incurred by the United States at the Site. In addition, Performing Settling Defendants (Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company, the County of Wayne and Crestwood Development) will submit a Remedial Action Plan ("RAP") to the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality ("MDEQ") by February 1, 1999. Upon approval of the RAP by MDEQ, the Performing Settling Defendants will implement the work outlined in the RAP by the dates specified in the RAP.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the proposed Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General of the Environmental and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, and should refer to *United States v. Crestwood Development, et al.*, D.J. Ref. 90-11-2-1291.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, 211 West Fort Street, Suite 2300, Detroit, MI 48226, at the Region 5 Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590, and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005, (202) 624-0892. A copy of the proposed Consent Decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005. In requesting a copy of the Consent Decree, please enclose a check payable to the Consent Decree Library in the amount of \$9 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) for a copy of the Consent Decree.

**Joel Gross,**

*Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.*

[FR Doc. 98-24447 Filed 9-10-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

##### Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

In accordance with Departmental policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that a proposed Consent Decree in *United States v. Joel G. Freeman, et al.*, Case No. 96 Civ. 2354 (CLB), was lodged on August 31, 1998, in the United States