

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Helen Dear, Contracting Officer's Technical Representative, Office of Traffic Injury Control Programs, (NTS-14), National Highway Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Room 5119, Washington, D.C. 20590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

NHTSA will conduct a survey as a major component of a two-site evaluation of its Bystander Care program. The other components of this evaluation include a review of existing EMS records, and a review of attendance records from providers of Bystander Care training. In accordance with the agency's mandate to reduce fatalities and economic loss resulting from motor vehicle crashes, the Bystander Care program was established to encourage passerbys to stop at rural crash sites, render life-saving assistance, and summon emergency medical services (EMS). The program is designed to raise public awareness of the importance of bystander care, and to teach the few basic skills necessary to recognize an emergency, start victims' breathing, stop victims' bleeding, and contact EMS. The program focuses on rural areas because a disproportionate number of fatalities occur there, possibly because of longer EMS response times, and fewer passerbys.

The data from the survey will be used to evaluate the extent to which the bystander care messages have reached the public in targeted areas, the extent to which these messages were successful in changing attitudes towards providing emergency care, and the extent to which the program improved knowledge needed to successfully provide emergency care.

The longitudinal telephone survey will be conducted in two waves: prior to the public campaign the first survey will gather baseline data. The second survey, approximately one year after the inception of the program, will assess changes from that baseline.

Data from the evaluation will be used by NHTSA in judging the efficacy of the bystander care program. The design of the study will enable NHTSA to measure the impact of the program and improve the program by diagnosing any problem areas.

II. Method of Data Collection

The survey will be conducted by telephone in two program sites. The baseline survey will interview a sample of approximately 400 individuals over the age of 15, and the follow-up survey

will attempt reinterviews with all baseline respondents. Reinterview rates of 75-80 percent are expected. In addition, the follow-up survey will interview an additional 300 respondents to control for the potential sensitizing effects of the baseline survey on the panel respondents. The interviews will be aided by a computerized system to minimize interviewing and recording errors. The survey will be anonymous and confidential, and participation will be voluntary.

The instruments will consist of three modules. The first module will gather information indicating the respondents' familiarity with the Bystander Care messages. This information will provide a gauge of the breadth of dissemination. The second module will gather information about respondent attitudes towards, and knowledge about, providing emergency care. Comparisons of this information before and after the campaign will provide a measure of the program's impact. The third and final module will gather demographic information about the respondents. The follow-up instrument will include only the first two modules for panel respondents. The modules for the follow-up survey will include a small number of items not asked of baseline respondents.

III. Use of Findings

The findings will be used to judge the efficacy of the Bystander Care program. NHTSA will draw on this information when considering continuation, refinement, and expansion of the Bystander Care program.

IV. Data

OMB Number: None.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission.

Affected Public: The population of two rural sites age 16 and older living in households with telephones.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 400 first wave, 560 second wave.

Estimated Time Per Respondent: 10-15 minutes.

Estimated Total Burden: 160-240 total hours.

Estimated Total Cost: \$17.50 per survey (baseline); \$19.75 per survey (follow-up).

V. Requests for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the estimated burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed data collection; (c)

ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for approval by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) of this information collection. Copies of all comments will be placed in Docket 97-004, Notice 1, in the NHTSA Docket Section in Room 5109, Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590, and will become a matter of public record.

James H. Hedlund,

Associate Administrator for Traffic Safety Programs.

[FR Doc. 97-2252 Filed 1-31-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-M

[Docket No. 97-006; Notice 1]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1992 Mercedes-Benz 230CE 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 230CE 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 230CE 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 March 3, 1997.

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), 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.

Champagne Imports, Inc. of Lansdale, Pennsylvania (Registered Importer No. R-90-009) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1992 Mercedes-Benz 230CE passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicle which Champagne believes is substantially similar is the 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300CE. Champagne has submitted information indicating that Daimler Benz, A.G., the company that manufactured the 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300CE, 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 230CE to the 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300CE, 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 230CE, as originally manufactured, conforms to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as the 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300CE 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 230CE is identical to the certified 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300CE 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*, 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*, 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 1992 Mercedes-Benz 230CE 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 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 which incorporate U.S.-model headlamps; (b) installation of U.S.-model front and rear sidemarker/reflector assemblies; (c) installation of U.S.-model taillamp assemblies; (c) 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 rear view mirror.

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

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. 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; (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 with a combination lap and shoulder restraint that adjusts by means of an automatic retractor and releases by means of a single push button in each front designated seating position, and with combination lap and shoulder restraints with a single button release in both rear outboard seating positions.

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.

Additionally, the petitioner states that a vehicle identification number (VIN) plate must be affixed to the vehicle to comply with 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 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: January 29, 1997.

Marilynne Jacobs,
Director,

Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 97-2605 Filed 1-31-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

Surface Transportation Board**Agency Information Collection Under OMB Review**

The following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of