and alignment will be incorporated into, and analyzed with, the various build alternatives. SR–204 would be widened on one or both sides of the existing alignment.

Information letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments on the proposed project will be sent to appropriate Federal, State and local agencies, as well as to private organizations and individuals who have previously expressed interest, or who are expected to be interested, in the proposed project. An initial public scoping meeting is expected to be held in the City of Ogden during May 1997. Notice of additional public meetings to present information and solicit comments relative to alternatives for consideration and possible impacts will be given as the proposed project proceeds. In addition, a public hearing will be held. Upon release of the draft EIS, public notice will be given of the time and place for a public hearing. The draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment prior to the public hearing.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues are identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS should be directed to the FHWA or UDOT at the address provided above.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Research, Planning and Construction. The regulations impending Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)

Issued on: April 9, 1997.

Michael G. Ritchie,

Division Administrator, Salt Lake City, Utah.

[FR Doc. 97–9624 Filed 4–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket Nos. 96–126, Notice 2; 96–131, Notice 2; 96–132, Notice 2; 97–003, Notice 2; 97–005, Notice 2; 97–006, Notice 2; 97–007, Notice 2; 97–008, Notice 2; 97–009, Notice 2; 97–010, Notice 2; 97–011, Notice 2; and 97–012, Notice 2]

Decision That Certain Nonconforming Motor Vehicles Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of decision by NHTSA that certain nonconforming motor vehicles are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the decision by NHTSA that certain motor vehicles not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are eligible for importation into the United States because they are substantially similar to vehicles originally manufactured for importation into and/or sale in the United States and certified by their manufacturers as complying with the safety standards, and they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: This decision is effective April 15, 1997.

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**.

NHTSA received petitions from registered importers to decide whether the vehicles listed in Annex A to this notice are eligible for importation into the United States. To afford an opportunity for public comment, NHTSA published notice of these petitions as specified in Annex A. The reader is referred to those notices for a thorough description of the petitions. No comments were received in response to these notices. Based on its review of the information submitted by the petitioners, NHTSA has decided to grant the petitions.

Vehicle Eligibility Number for Subject Vehicles

The importer of a vehicle admissible under any final decision must indicate on the form HS–7 accompanying entry the appropriate vehicle eligibility number indicating that the vehicle is eligible for entry. Vehicle eligibility numbers assigned to vehicles admissible under this decision are specified in Annex A.

Final Decision

Accordingly, on the basis of the foregoing, NHTSA hereby decides that each motor vehicle listed in Annex A to this notice, which was not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards, is substantially similar to a motor vehicle manufactured for importation into and/or sale in the United States, and certified under 49 U.S.C. 30115, as specified in Annex A, and is capable of being readily altered to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

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: April 10, 1997.

Marilynne Jacobs,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

Annex A—Nonconforming Motor Vehicles Decided To Be Eligible for Importation

1. Docket No. 96–126
   Nonconforming Vehicle: 1986 Mazda RX–7
   Substantially similar U.S.-certified vehicle: 1986 Mazda RX–7
   Notice of Petition published at: 62 FR 1143 (January 8, 1997)
   Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–199
2. Docket No. 96–131
   Nonconforming Vehicles: 1992 through 1996 BMW 325i
   Substantially similar U.S.-certified vehicles: 1992 through 1996 BMW 325i
   Notice of Petition published at: 62 FR 1145 (January 8, 1997)
   Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–197
3. Docket No. 96–132
   Nonconforming Vehicle: 1984 Nissan 300ZX
   Substantially similar U.S.-certified vehicle: 1984 Nissan 300ZX
   Notice of Petition published at: 62 FR 1144 (January 8, 1997)
   Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–198
4. Docket No. 97–003
   Nonconforming Vehicles: 1987 and 1988 Toyota Vans
   Substantially similar U.S.-certified vehicles: 1987 and 1988 Toyota Vans

Notice of Petition published at: 62 FR 3940 (January 27, 1997)
Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–200

5. Docket No. 97–005
Nonconforming Vehicles: 1991–1996 Ducati 900SS Motorcycles
Substantially similar U.S.-certified vehicles: 1991–1996 Ducati 900SS Motorcycles
Notice of Petition published at: 62 FR 4829 (January 31, 1997)
Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–201

6. Docket No. 97–006
Nonconforming Vehicle: 1992 Mercedes-Benz 230CE
Substantially similar U.S.-certified vehicle: 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300CE
Notice of Petition published at: 62 FR 5067 (February 3, 1997)
Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–203

7. Docket No. 97–007
Nonconforming Vehicle: 1994 Mercedes-Benz C280
Substantially similar U.S.-certified vehicle: 1994 Mercedes-Benz C280
Notice of Petition published at: 62 FR 6611 (February 12, 1997)
Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–204

8. Docket No. 97–008
Nonconforming Vehicle: 1990 BMW 325iX
Substantially similar U.S.-certified vehicle: 1990 BMW 325iX
Notice of Petition published at: 62 FR 6609 (February 12, 1997)
Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–205

9. Docket No. 97–009
Nonconforming Vehicle: 1994 Mercedes-Benz E200
Substantially similar U.S.-certified vehicles: 1994 Mercedes-Benz E320
Notice of Petition published at: 62 FR 6613 (February 12, 1997)
Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–207

10. Docket No. 97–010
Nonconforming Vehicle: 1983 Suzuki GSX750 Motorcycle
Substantially similar U.S.-certified vehicles: 1983 Suzuki GS750 Motorcycle
Notice of Petition published at: 62 FR 6614 (February 12, 1997)
Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–208

11. Docket No. 97–011
Nonconforming Vehicles: 1972 through 1997 Harley Davidson FX, FL, and XL Series Motorcycles
Substantially similar U.S.-certified vehicles: 1972 through 1997 Harley Davidson FX, FL, and XL Series Motorcycles
Notice of Petition published at: 62 FR 6612 (February 12, 1997)
Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–202

12. Docket No. 97–012
Nonconforming Vehicle: 1974 MGB Roadster
Substantially similar U.S.-certified vehicle: 1974 MGB Roadster
Notice of Petition published at: 62 FR 6615 (February 12, 1997)
Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–206

[FR Doc. 97–9701 Filed 4–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 96–099; Notice 2]

Denial of Petition for Import Eligibility Decision

This notice sets forth the reasons for the denial of a petition submitted to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A). The petition, which was submitted by LPC of New York, Inc. of Ronkonkoma, New York (''LPC''), a registered importer of motor vehicles, requested NHTSA to decide that 1995–1996 GMC and Chevrolet Suburban multipurpose passenger vehicles (MPVs) that were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are eligible for importation into the United States. In the petition, LPC contended that these vehicle are eligible for importation on the basis that (1) they are substantially similar to vehicles that were originally manufactured for sale in the United States and that were certified by their manufacturer as complying with the safety standards (the U.S.-certified version of 1995–1996 GMC and Chevrolet Suburbans), and (2) they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

NHTSA published a notice in the **Federal Register** on September 25, 1996 (61 FR 50371) that contained a thorough description of the petition, and solicited public comments upon it. One comment was received in response to the notice, from the North American Operations Division of General Motors Corporation (''GM''), the corporate parent of GM de Mexico, the manufacturer of the subject vehicles. In this comment, GM contended that non-U.S. certified 1995–1996 GMC and Chevrolet Suburban MPVs should not be eligible for importation because they may not be substantially similar to vehicles that were originally manufactured and certified for sale in the United States. Moreover, GM noted that extensive certification testing has not been conducted to determine whether these vehicles are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards. GM stated that during the 1995 and 1996 model years, GM de Mexico produced only Chevrolet Suburbans for sale and use in that country, and that the company did not market any GMC Suburbans in Mexico. GM observed that these vehicles were not certified as meeting Federal motor vehicle safety standards (FMVSS).

GM noted that Chevrolet Suburbans manufactured for sale and use in Mexico contain approximately 750 parts that differ from those used on Suburbans manufactured for sale and use in the United States. The company stated that a substantial number of these parts are produced by Mexican suppliers and are not subject to the same warranty and approval process that is used by GM in purchasing parts that may affect compliance with applicable FMVSS. Parts that GM has purchased without following these procedures include ones that it describes as potentially affecting compliance with Standard Nos. 105 *Hydraulic Brake Systems*, 119 *New Pneumatic Tires for Vehicles other than Passenger Cars*, 120 *Tire Selection and Rims for Motor Vehicles other than Passenger Cars*, 201 *Occupant Protection in Interior Impact*, 202 *Head Restraints*, 205 *Glazing Materials*, 207 *Seating Systems*, 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*, 301 *Fuel System Integrity*, and 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials*. Although GM acknowledged that it was unable to state that a vehicle built with the parts in question would not meet these standards, the company reiterated that neither it nor GM de Mexico has undertaken the testing that would be necessary to establish such compliance.

GM further observed that Mexican standards contain requirements for glazing, tires, brake fluids, batteries, and safety belts that differ from those in the corresponding FMVSS. Additionally, the company asserted that Mexico has no requirements similar to those in Standard Nos. 102 *Transmission Shift Lever Sequence, Starter Interlock, and Transmission Braking Effect*, 124 *Accelerator Control Sequence*, 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*, 214 *Side Impact Protection*, or 301 *Fuel System Integrity*, and to requirements in portions of Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment*. Citing examples, GM stated that vehicles manufactured for the Mexican market have no center high mounted stop lamps or air bags. Additionally, the company contended that these vehicles have engines that may not meet Standard Nos. 102 and 124.

In response to a follow-up inquiry from NHTSA, GM stated that the 750 parts in Mexican Suburbans that are not found in the U.S.-certified versions of the vehicle have different part numbers from their U.S. equivalents. GM asserted that the assignment of a different part number is due to some difference in product design specifications and not simply to a difference in supplier. The