

Proposed charge expiration date: July 31, 2000.

Total estimated PFC revenue: \$332,000.

Brief description of proposed project(s):

PROJECTS TO IMPOSE AND USE: Acquire Snow Removal Equipment, Update Airport Master Plan, Interactive Training Equipment, PFC Administration, Groove and Mark Runway 9/27.

IMPOSE-ONLY PROJECT: Terminal Building Improvements.

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: Air.

Taxi/Commercial Operators filing FAA Form 1800-31.

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 Rhinelander-Oneida County Airport.

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois on December 4, 1995.

Benito De Leon,

Manager, Planning and Programming Branch, Airports Division, Great Lakes Region.

[FR Doc. 95-30100 Filed 12-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Petition for Exemption From the Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Jaguar

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Grant of petition for exemption.

SUMMARY: This notice grants in full the petition of Jaguar Cars Limited (Jaguar) for an exemption of a high-theft line (whose nameplate is confidential) from the parts-marking requirements of the vehicle theft prevention standard. This petition is granted because the agency has determined that the antitheft device to be placed on the line as standard equipment is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements.

DATES: The exemption granted by this notice is effective beginning with the (confidential) model year.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms Barbara Gray, Office of Market Incentives, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street,

S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590. Ms Gray's telephone number is (202) 366-1740. Her fax number is (202) 493-2739.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On July 31, 1995, Jaguar Cars, on behalf of Jaguar Cars Limited, submitted to NHTSA a petition for exemption from the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standard (49 CFR Part 541) for a motor vehicle line. The nameplate of the line and the model year of introduction are confidential. The petition has been filed pursuant to 49 CFR Part 543, *Exemption from Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard*, based on the installation of an antitheft device as standard equipment for an entire vehicle line.

Jaguar's submittal is considered a complete petition, as required by 49 CFR Part 543.7, in that it meets the general requirements contained in § 543.5 and the specific content requirements of § 543.6. In a letter to Jaguar dated August 18, 1995, the agency granted the petitioner's request for confidential treatment of most aspects of its petition, including the nameplate of the line and the model year of its introduction.

In its petition, Jaguar provided a detailed description and diagram of the identity, design, and location of the components of the antitheft device for the new line. This antitheft device includes an engine starter interrupt function and an alarm function. The antitheft device is activated by operating a radio frequency ("RF") transmitter or by removing the ignition key and locking the doors with it.

In order to ensure reliability and durability of the device, Jaguar stated that it conducted tests for performance under conditions of vibration, humidity, and temperature extremes, as well as for endurance, flammability, resistance to fluids, thermal shock, RFC and EMC, and overall performance. Jaguar stated its belief that the device is reliable and durable since the device complied with Jaguar's specified requirements for each test.

Jaguar also compared the device proposed for its new line with devices which NHTSA has previously determined to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as would compliance with the parts-marking requirements of Part 541, and has concluded that the antitheft device proposed for this new line is no less effective than those devices in the lines for which NHTSA has already granted exemptions from the parts-marking requirements.

Jaguar bases its belief on the ease of use of the antitheft system it is proposing for the new car line. In

addition, it points out that other Jaguar models, which are all parts-marked, all have theft rates below the median theft rate according to NHTSA's vehicle theft data published on November 29, 1994 (59 FR 61023). Other aspects of the system cited by Jaguar as reasons why it should be as effective as parts-marking are the shielding of the driver's door lock barrel to prevent opening by "Slim-Jims" and other tools; the location of the hood latch control; location of the battery, which is protected by the security system; the capability of the alarm to function when the battery has been reconnected after having been disconnected; and a flashing LED and warning labels that advise unauthorized persons that the vehicle is protected by a security system. Jaguar believes that the theft rate for this vehicle line equipped with this antitheft device as standard equipment will be below the most recent median theft rate of 3.5826 published by NHTSA.

Based on evidence submitted by Jaguar, the agency believes that the antitheft device for the new Jaguar line is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standards (49 CFR Part 541).

The agency believes that the device will provide the types of performance listed in 49 CFR Part 543.6(a)(3): Promoting activation; attracting attention to unauthorized entries; preventing defeat or circumvention of the device by unauthorized persons; preventing operation of the vehicle by unauthorized entrants; and ensuring the reliability and durability of the device.

As required by 49 U.S.C. 33106 and 49 CFR Part 543.6(a)(4) and (5), the agency finds that Jaguar has provided adequate reasons for its belief that the antitheft device will reduce and deter theft. This conclusion is based on the information Jaguar provided about its device, much of which is confidential. This confidential information included a description of reliability and functional tests conducted by Jaguar for the antitheft device and its components.

For the foregoing reasons, the agency hereby grants in full Jaguar's petition for exemption for vehicle line (confidential) from the parts-marking requirements of 49 CFR Part 541.

If Jaguar decides not to use the exemption for this line, it should formally notify the agency. If such a decision is made, the line must be fully marked according to the requirements under 49 CFR Parts 541.5 and 541.6 (marking of major component parts and replacement parts).

NHTSA notes that if Jaguar wishes in the future to modify the device on which this exemption is based, the company may have to submit a petition to modify the exemption. Part 543.7(d) states that a Part 543 exemption applies only to vehicles that belong to a line exempted under this part and equipped with the antitheft device on which the line's exemption is based. Further, Part 543.9(c)(2) provides for the submission of petitions "to modify an exemption to permit the use of an antitheft device similar to but differing from the one specified in that exemption." The agency wishes to minimize the administrative burden with Part 543.9(c)(2) could place on exempted vehicle manufacturers and itself.

The agency did not intend in drafting Part 543 to require the submission of a modification petition for every change to the components or design of an antitheft device. The significance of many such changes could be de minimis. Therefore, NHTSA suggests that if the manufacturer contemplates making any changes the effects of which might be characterized as de minimis, it should consult the agency before preparing and submitting a petition to modify.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 33106; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.

Issued on: December 6, 1995.

Barry Felrice,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 95-30101 Filed 12-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

[Docket No. 95-94; Notice 1]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1991 BMW 735IL Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1991 BMW 735IL 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 1991 BMW 735IL 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 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 January 10, 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 had decided that the motor vehicle is substantially similar to a motor vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and for 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.

Champagne Imports, Inc. of Lansdale, Pennsylvania ("Champagne") (Registered Importer 90-009) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1991 BMW 735IL passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicle which Champagne believes is substantially similar is the 1991 BMW 735IL that was manufactured for importation into, and sale in, the United States and certified by its manufacturer, Bayerische Motoren Werke A.G., as conforming to all

applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared the non-U.S. certified 1991 BMW 735IL to its U.S. certified counterpart, 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 non-U.S. certified 1991 BMW 735IL, as originally manufactured, conforms to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as its U.S. certified counterpart, or is capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that the non-U.S. certified 1991 BMW 735IL is identical to its U.S. certified counterpart 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*, 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*, 211 *Wheel Nuts, Wheel Discs and Hubcaps*, 212 *Windshield Retention*, 216 *Roof Crush Resistance*, 219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion*, and 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials*.

Additionally, the petitioner states that the non-U.S. certified 1991 BMW 735IL 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 an ECE symbol on the brake failure indicator lamp; (b) installation of a 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 headlamp assemblies which incorporate sealed beam headlamps; (b) installation of U.S.-model front and rear sidemarker/reflector assemblies; (c) installation of U.S.-model taillamp assemblies; (d)