

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: July 25, 1996.

Marilynne Jacobs,  
Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.  
[FR Doc. 96-19367 Filed 7-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

[Docket No. 96-084; Notice 1]

**Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1995 Jeep Cherokee Multi-Purpose Passenger Vehicles Are Eligible for Importation**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1995 Jeep Cherokee multi-purpose passenger vehicles (MPVs) 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 1995 Jeep Cherokee 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.

**DATE:** The closing date for comments on the petition is August 30, 1996.

**ADDRESS:** 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.

Champagne Imports, Inc. of Lansdale, Pennsylvania ("Champagne") (Registered Importer 90-009) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1995 Jeep Cherokee MPVs are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicle which Champagne believes is substantially similar is the 1995 Jeep Cherokee that was manufactured for sale in the United States and certified by its manufacturer, Chrysler Corporation, as conforming to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared the non-U.S. certified 1995 Jeep Cherokee 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 1995 Jeep Cherokee, 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 1995 Jeep Cherokee is identical to its U.S. certified counterpart 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*, 113 *Hood Latch Systems*, 116 *Brake Fluid*, 119 *New*

*Pneumatic Tires for Vehicles other than Passenger Cars*, 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*, 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*, and 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials*.

Additionally, the petitioner states that the non-U.S. certified 1995 Jeep Cherokee 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) Placement of the word "Brake" on the brake failure indicator lamp lens; (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.

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 microswitch and a warning buzzer in the steering lock assembly.

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. 120 *Tire Selection and Rims for Motor Vehicles other than Passenger Cars*: installation of a tire information placard.

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 switch actuated seat belt warning lamp and buzzer. 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 with combination lap and shoulder restraints that release by means of a single push button at both rear outboard seating positions, and with a lap belt at the rear center seating position.

**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, 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 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: July 25, 1996.

Marilynne Jacobs,

*Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.*  
[FR Doc. 96-19368 Filed 7-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

---

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Customs Service

[T.D. 96-59]

#### Dissemination of Information Product and Elimination of Microfiche

**AGENCY:** U. S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.

**ACTION:** Final notice of new information dissemination.

**SUMMARY:** On February 22, 1996, the U.S. Customs Service published a document in the Federal Register soliciting comments on providing its rulings, future publications and

additional information in two new formats (CD-ROM and the Internet) with built-in search capabilities and "hypertext" links. In addition, the Customs Service solicited public comments on the elimination of one existing format used to supply rulings to the public by subscription (microfiche). After analysis of the comments received and further consideration, Customs in this document announces a decision not to issue CD-ROMS with a search engine at this time, advises the public that Customs information will be available on the Internet's World Wide Web, effective August 1, 1996, and sets October 1, 1996 as the date for elimination of the microfiche.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

For the Internet: Karen Hjelmervik, 202-927-0826.

For the microfiche: Thomas Budnik, 202-482-6909.

For the Public CD-ROM: Stuart P. Seidel, 202-482-6900.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

In accordance with OMB Circular A-130 and Section 2 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13, 44 U.S.C. 3506(d)), Customs published a document in the Federal Register on February 22, 1996 (61 FR 6892), soliciting comments from the public on (1) the dissemination of Customs information by CD-ROM (Compact Disc-read only memory); (2) dissemination of information on the Internet; and (3) the elimination of microfiche rulings by subscription. A total of 41 comments were received. Comments were received from importers, law firms, accounting firms, Customs brokers, consultants, commercial publishers, several trade organizations and a bar association. Some comments addressed all three issues, while others only commented on one or two of the issues presented. This document summarizes the comments received and the decisions reached as a result of those comments.

##### CD-ROM

A majority of the comments favored making the information listed in the notice available with a search engine in CD-ROM by subscription. Some of the comments expressed concern over use of a proprietary search engine and suggested that the material be issued in ASCII, WordPerfect or DOS text format as well as, or in lieu of, Folio Views®. This alternative would have made the information available in plain text, which could then be converted into other formats by the users. These

alternative formats could not, however, be linked to other documents. One comment suggested issuance of the CD-ROM in the Apple Macintosh Folio format. Those who favored issuing a CD-ROM believed that it would provide timely information in an easily searchable format, thereby meeting the Customs Modernization Act's authorization for the Secretary to make available in an efficient, comprehensive and timely manner, all information necessary for importers and exporters to comply with the Customs laws and regulations. Several comments were received which opposed making a CD-ROM with a search engine available to the public, because the product would directly compete with commercial CD-ROM publishers who had made considerable financial investments, and because the CD-ROM proposed by Customs would utilize a proprietary format, thereby preventing, or making more difficult, its use by commercial publishers of competing products. In addition to the written comments, representatives of Customs met with representatives of some of the commercial electronic publishers. At this meeting, concerns were expressed over Customs direct competition with commercial products, subscription costs, proprietary formats and publication frequency. Several publishers indicated that Customs proposed CD-ROM could put them out of business.

##### Internet

Customs also proposed placing its rulings, publications and other information of interest to the public on the Internet with hypertext links and search capability. Over 20 comments were received in favor of this proposal, although two suggested plain text or no search capabilities. Only one comment, based on security concerns was received in opposition to this proposal. Some commenters suggested that the Internet offered a better dissemination capability than the CD-ROM, because it was available to more users and could be updated more frequently.

##### Microfiche

Of the 16 comments received concerning elimination of the microfiche rulings, eight favored immediate elimination. Several other commenters believed that the microfiche could be eliminated if comparable material were made available in electronic media. Several commenters suggested that Customs prepare a cumulative index of the microfiche ruling numbers and make it available on a closeout microfiche and