participating in all discussions sponsored by the Intelligent Transportation Society of America (ITS America) that have been taking place between DSRC users and manufacturers. The FHWA understands that significant progress has been made toward agreement on a broad DSRC standard in the ASTM Draft No. 7 DSRC standard, prepared with industry and user participation. It is clear that the DSRC industry and users have been striving to make progress on the national DSRC standards—many work on their own time and at their own expense. The USDOT is sincerely appreciative for this cooperative effort, and will continue to encourage the DSRC industry to do its part. The need for national interoperability for CVO applications is becoming more critical. Also, the total national investment in non-interoperable ETTM equipment continues to grow rapidly. The USDOT would prefer that the DSRC industry and users set the necessary DSRC standards through a consensus building process among the DSRC vendor and user communities, which the USDOT is sponsoring through ITS America. It is imperative that the DSRC standards be ready for ballot by the end of 1997. If the ballottable standard is not available by that time, for publication by June 1998, of the endorsed DSRC standards, a meeting will be held under the ITS America auspices between the USDOT, the DSRC users, and the manufacturers to determine the extent of the delay. If a significant impasse to progress remains at the conclusion of that meeting, the USDOT will initiate a rulemaking action to establish the necessary standards to allow interoperability between DSRC applications.

(Sec. 6053(b), Pub. L. 102–240, 105 Stat. 1914; 23 U.S.C. 307 note; 49 CFR 1.48)

Issued on: November 19, 1997.

**Kenneth R. Wykle,**

*Federal Highway Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 97–31243 Filed 11–26–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

---

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## Federal Highway Administration

**[FHWA Docket No. FHWA–97–2907]**

## Outdoor Advertising Control

**AGENCY:** Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Nevada Department of Transportation (NVDOT) proposes to amend the Highway Beautification Federal/State Agreement dated January 21, 1972, between the United States of America represented by the Secretary of Transportation and the State of Nevada.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before December 29, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit written, signed comments to FHWA Docket FHWA–97–2907, the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Docket Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20590. All comments received will be available for examination at the above address between 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Those desiring notification of receipt of comments must include a self-addressed, stamped envelope/postcard.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Robert A. Johnson, Chief, Program Services Division, Office of Real Estate Services, HRE–20, (202) 366–2020; or Mr. Robert Black, Office of Chief Counsel, HCC–31, (202) 366–1359, Federal Highway Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20590. Office hours are from 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Highway Beautification Act of 1965 (HBA), codified at 23 U.S.C. § 131, requires States to provide effective control of outdoor advertising in the areas adjacent to both the Interstate System and Federal-aid primary system. States must provide effective control as a condition of receiving their full apportionment of Federal-aid Highway Funds. Effective control of outdoor advertising includes prohibiting the erection of new advertising signs except for certain categories of signs listed at § 131(c).

One of these sign categories, ''off premise'' signs, may be allowed by a State in zoned or unzoned commercial or industrial areas. Signs in such areas must conform to the requirements of an agreement between the State and the Federal Government which establishes size, lighting, and spacing criteria consistent with customary use. The agreement between Nevada and the FHWA was executed January 21, 1972.

The 1972 agreement states that the State of Nevada may permit signs to be erected no closer than 500 feet from an intersection outside ''incorporated villages and cities.'' The amendment to the agreement, the exact language of which is set forth below, would use the term ''urbanized area boundaries'' as defined by 23 U.S.C. § 101(a) in place of ''incorporated villages and cities.''

In April 1980 the FHWA adopted a procedure to be followed if a State requested a change in the Federal/State agreement. A State must first submit its proposed change, along with the reasons for the change and the effects of such change, to the FHWA Division Office. The Division, Region, and headquarters offices all review and comment on the proposal. If the concept is approved, the State must then hold public hearings on the proposed change to receive comments from the public. If the State then wishes to amend the agreement, it must submit: (1) the justification for the change; (2) the record of the hearings; and (3) an assessment of the impact. These are summarized and published in the **Federal Register** for comments. Comments on the proposed amended agreement will then be evaluated by the FHWA. The FHWA will then decide if the agreement should be amended as proposed and will publish its decision in the **Federal Register**. An amended agreement will then be sent to the State for signature.

Nevada has completed the above procedure up to the point of publishing in the **Federal Register**. No negative comments were received in response to the State's public hearings on this proposed change, and several supportive comments were received. Nevada's formal request provides justification for the proposed revision to the 1972 Federal/State Agreement. The primary issue is that the term ''urbanized area boundaries'' would be more consistent with the Code of Federal Regulations (23 CFR 750, Subpart G) which speaks primarily of urban areas, rather than incorporated cities, towns, or villages. The change in the agreement is aimed primarily at effective control of billboards in Clark County (Las Vegas), Nevada, where a vast part of the metropolitan area is outside the incorporated city limits of Las Vegas. The State of Nevada believes that this change in the agreement could allow between 20 and 24 new billboard sites primarily in the Las Vegas area. The State maintains that this would result in minimal aesthetic impact because the urban areas are generally developed and contain numerous on-premise signs.

### The Proposed Change

The Federal/State Agreement ''For Carrying Out the National Policy Relative to Control of Outdoor Advertising in Areas Adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and the Federal-Aid Primary System'' made and entered on January 21, 1972, between the United States of America represented by the Secretary of Transportation acting by and through the Federal Highway

Administrator and the State of Nevada now reads at *Section III: STATE CONTROL,* Paragraph 2. b. *Spacing of Signs,* as follows: ''Outside of incorporated villages and cities, no structure may be located adjacent to or within 500 feet of an interchange, intersection at grade, or safety rest area. Said 500 feet to be measured along the Interstate or freeway from the beginning or ending of pavement widening at the exit from or entrance to the main-traveled way.''

The amended agreement would read as follows: ''Outside of urbanized area boundaries, as defined by 23 U.S.C. 101(a), no structure may be located adjacent to or within 500 feet of an interchange, intersection at grade, or safety rest area. Said 500 feet to be measured along the Interstate or freeway from the beginning or ending of pavement widening at the exit from or entrance to the main-traveled way.''

**Authority:** 23 U.S.C. 315; 49 CFR 1.48.

Issued on: November 19, 1997.

**Kenneth R. Wykle,**

*Federal Highway Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 97–31244 Filed 11–26–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

---

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

**[Docket No. NHTSA–97–3137; Notice 1]**

## Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1974 Alfa Romeo GTV Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

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

**ACTION:** Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1974 Alfa Romeo GTV 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 1974 Alfa Romeo GTV 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 December 29, 1997.

**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 10 a.m. to 5 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), 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 (''Champagne'') (Registered Importer 90–009) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1974 Alfa Romeo GTV passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicle which Champagne believes is substantially similar is the 1974 Alfa Romeo GTV that was manufactured for importation into, and sale in, the United States and certified by its manufacturer as conforming to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared the non-U.S. certified 1974 Alfa Romeo GTV 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 1974 Alfa Romeo GTV, 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 1974 Alfa Romeo GTV 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,* 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.*

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 a 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; (b) installation of U.S.-model front and rear sidemarker/reflector assemblies; (c) installation of U.S.-model taillamp assemblies.

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 microswitch in the steering lock assembly and a warning buzzer.