

agencies. Potentially affected environmental and social resources proposed for analysis include land use and neighborhoods impacts, residential and business displacements and relocations, traffic and parking impacts near stations, traffic circulation, visual impacts, impacts on cultural and archaeological resources, and noise and vibration impacts. Impacts on air and water quality, groundwater, hazardous waste sites, and water resources will also be covered. The impacts will be evaluated both for the construction period and for the long-term period of operation. Measures to mitigate adverse impacts will be considered.

V. FTA Procedures

A Re-Evaluation Major Investment Study (MIS) will initially be prepared to evaluate several rail and bus mode and alignment options. The MIS/Draft SEIS/SEIR and the conceptual engineering for the project will be prepared simultaneously. Following FTA approval, Preliminary Engineering would be conducted during preparation of the Final SEIS/SEIR. The impacts of these initial alternatives will be evaluated on a corridor-level basis during the Re-Evaluation/MIS and SEIS/SEIR scoping phase. The alternatives coming out of this initial evaluation will then be assessed in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. The Draft SEIS/SEIR/conceptual engineering process will assess the social, economic, and environmental impacts of the proposed alternatives at a project-level while refining their design to minimize and mitigate any adverse impacts. After its publication, the Draft SEIS/SEIR will be available for public and agency review and comment, and a public hearing will be held. On the basis of the Draft SEIS/SEIR and comments received, MTA will select a preferred alternative to carry forward into the Final SEIS/SEIR. The Final SEIS/SEIR will be based on information resulting from Preliminary Engineering.

Issued On: August 9, 1999.

Leslie Rogers,

Regional Administrator, Federal Transit Administration, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 99-20952 Filed 8-12-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-57-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-99-6081]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1999-2000 Ferrari 360 Modena Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1999-2000 Ferrari 360 Modena passenger cars are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This document announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that 1999-2000 Ferrari 360 Modena 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 September 13, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to the docket number and notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh St., SW, Washington, DC 20590. [Docket hours are from 9 am to 5 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), 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, 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**.

J.K. Motors of Kingsville, Maryland ("J.K.") (Registered Importer 90-006) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1999-2000 Ferrari 360 Modena passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles which J.K. believes are substantially similar are 1999-2000 Ferrari 360 Modena 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 non-U.S. certified 1999-2000 Ferrari 360 Modena 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.

J.K. submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 1999-2000 Ferrari 360 Modena 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 non-U.S. certified 1999-2000 Ferrari 360 Modena passenger cars are identical to their U.S. certified counterparts with respect to compliance with Standard Nos. 102 *Transmission Shift Lever Sequence*, 103 *Defrosting and Defogging Systems*, 104

Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems, 105 Hydraulic Brake Systems, 106 Brake Hoses, 109 New Pneumatic Tires, 113 Hood Latch Systems, 116 Brake Fluid, 124 Accelerator Control Systems, 201 Occupant Protection in Interior Impact, 202 Head Restraints, 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 Anchorages, 212 Windshield Retention, 216 Roof Crush Resistance, 219 Windshield Zone Intrusion, 301 Fuel System Integrity, and 302 Flammability of Interior Materials.

Additionally, the petitioner states that non-U.S. certified 1999–2000 Ferrari 360 Modena passenger cars comply with the Bumper Standard found in 49 CFR Part 581.

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 a noncomplying symbol on the brake failure indicator lamp; (b) replacement of the speedometer with one calibrated in miles per hour.

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment*: (a) installation of U.S.-model headlamps and front sidemarker lamps; (b) installation of U.S.-model taillamp assemblies and rear sidemarker lights; (c) installation of a U.S.-model high mounted stop lamp on vehicles that are not already so equipped.

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

Standard No. 111 *Rearview Mirror*: replacement of the passenger side rearview mirror with a U.S.-model component.

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

Standard No. 118 *Power Window Systems*: installation of a relay in the power window system so that the window transport is inoperative when the ignition is switched off.

Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*: (a) installation of a safety belt warning buzzer, wired to the driver’s seat belt latch; (b) replacement of the driver’s and passenger’s side air bags, control units, sensors, seat belts and knee bolsters with U.S.-model components on vehicles that are not already so equipped. The petitioner states that the vehicles are equipped at the front outboard seating positions

with combination lap and shoulder belts that are self tensioning and capable of being released by means of a single red push-button.

Standard No. 214 *Side Impact Protection*: installation of U.S.-model doorbars in vehicles that are not already so equipped.

The petitioner also states that a vehicle identification plate must be affixed to the vehicle near the left windshield post and a reference and certification label must be affixed in the area of the left front door post to meet the requirements of 49 CFR Part 565.

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on the petition described above. Comments should refer to the docket number and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh St., SW, Washington, DC 20590. [Docket hours are from 9 am to 5 pm.] 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: August 9, 1999.

Marilynne Jacobs,

*Director, Office of Vehicle Safety
Windshield Retention, 216 Roof Crush Resistance, 219 Windshield Zone Intrusion, 301 Fuel System Integrity, and 302 Flammability of Interior Materials.
Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 99–20960 Filed 8–12–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA 99–5698; Notice 2]

American Honda Motor Company, Inc.; Grant of Application for Second Renewal of Temporary Exemption From Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 122

For the reasons expressed below, we are granting the application by American Honda Motor Co., Inc., of Torrance, California (“Honda”), for a second renewal of its temporary

exemption from the fade and water recovery requirements of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 122 *Motorcycle brake systems*. Honda asserted that an exemption would make easier the development or field evaluation of a new motor vehicle safety feature providing a safety level at least equal to the safety level of the standard.

We published notice of receipt of Honda’s application on May 24, 1999, and afforded an opportunity for comment (64 FR 28025). No comments were received responding to this notice.

The discussion that follows is based on information contained in Honda’s application.

Why Honda Needs Again To Renew Its Temporary Exemption To Make Easier the Development or Field Evaluation of a New Motor Vehicle Safety Feature Providing a Safety Level at Least Equal to the Safety Level of Standard No. 122

We previously granted Honda NHTSA Temporary Exemption No. 97–1, expiring September 1, 1998, from the following requirements of 49 CFR 571.122 Standard No. 122 *Motorcycle brake systems*: S5.4.1 Baseline check—minimum and maximum pedal forces, S5.4.2 Fade, S5.4.3 Fade recovery, S5.7.2 Water recovery test, and S6.10 Brake actuation forces (62 FR 52372, October 7, 1997). This exemption covered Honda’s 1998 CBR1100XX motorcycle. Honda later applied for an extension of its exemption to September 1, 1999, to cover the 1999 model CBR1100XX motorcycle. This request was also granted (63 FR 65272, November 25, 1998). Now Honda has applied for the exemption to continue for another year to cover the 2000 model CBR1100XX motorcycle. The 2000 model of the CBR1100XX will be mechanically identical to the 1999 model. Under Temporary Exemption No. 97–1, Honda has sold far less than 2,500 exempted 1998 and 1999 model CBR1100XX motorcycles.

Honda’s original and renewed requests concern exemption “from the requirement of the minimum hand-lever force of five pounds in the base line check for the fade and water recovery tests.” The company continues to evaluate the marketability of an “improved” motorcycle brake system setting which is currently applied to the model sold in Europe. The difference in setting is limited to a softer master cylinder return spring in the European version. Using the softer spring results in a “more predictable (linear) feeling during initial brake lever application,” and “allows a more predictable rise in brake gain.” Honda considers that