

alignments; and (3) other alternatives that may arise from public and agency input.

Coordination letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate federal, state, and local agencies. Public meetings were held to discuss concept alignments in January and February 1997 and public comments were received. The draft environmental impact statement (EIS) will be prepared and made available for public and agency review and comment. Comments from the initial coordination letters and the public meetings will be considered in determining the scope of the EIS.

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

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Research, Planning and Construction. The provisions of Executive Order 12372 regarding state and local clearinghouse review of federal and federally assisted programs and projects apply to this program.)

Issued on October 15, 1999.

Charles S. Boyd,

Division Administrator, Tennessee Division, Nashville, Tennessee.

[FR Doc. 99-28174 Filed 10-27-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement, Polk County, TN

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an Environmental Impact Statement will be prepared for a proposed highway project in Polk County, Tennessee.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Charles S. Boyd, Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, 640 Grassmere Park, Suite 112, Nashville, Tennessee 37211, Telephone: (615) 781-5770.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the Tennessee Department of Transportation, will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on a proposal to improve U.S. Route 64

(U.S. 64) in Polk County, Tennessee. The proposed project would involve improvements to a section of the U.S. 64 roadway between U.S. 411 on the west and State Route 68 in Ducktown for a distance of about 42 kilometers (26) miles.

Improvements to the corridor are considered necessary to provide for existing and projected traffic demand and to improve safety. Alternatives under consideration include (1) taking no action; and (2) widening the existing two-lane highway to four lanes to the east and west of the Ocoee River Gorge, and constructing a four-lane divided highway on new location to bypass existing U.S. 64 through the Ocoee River Gorge.

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, State and local agencies, and to private organizations and citizens who have previously expressed or are known to have an interest in this proposal. A public hearing will be held upon completion of the Draft EIS and public notice will be given of the time and place of the hearing. The Draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment prior to the public hearing. A formal scoping meeting is planned.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues 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 at the address provided above.

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

Issued on October 15, 1999.

Charles S. Boyd,

Division Administrator, Tennessee Division, Nashville, Tennessee.

[FR Doc. 99-28175 Filed 10-27-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

[FRA Docket No. FRA-1999-5685, Notice No. 3]

RIN 2130-AB33

Proposed Joint Statement of Agency Policy Concerning Shared Use of the General Railroad System by Conventional Railroads and Light Rail Transit Systems

AGENCIES: Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), DOT.

ACTION: Extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: By notice of a proposed policy statement published on May 25, 1999 (64 FR 28238), FRA and FTA proposed how they intend to coordinate use of their respective safety authorities to address safety issues related to light rail transit operations that take place, or are planned to take place, on the general railroad system of transportation. The proposal also summarized how the process of obtaining waivers of FRA's safety regulations may work, particularly where the light rail and conventional rail operations occur at different times of day. In that notice, the deadline for the submission of written comments was July 30, 1999. By notice published on July 28, 1999 (64FR 40931), the deadline for the submission of written comments was extended until October 29, 1999.

Due to the need to ensure that all interested parties have a sufficient amount of time to fully develop their comments, and because FRA's separate proposed statement of agency policy concerning its safety jurisdiction over railroad passenger operations is not yet published, this document announces an additional extension of the deadline for the submission of written comments.

DATES: Written comments must be received by January 14, 2000. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent possible without incurring additional expense or delay.

ADDRESSES: Procedures for written comments: Submit one copy to the Department of Transportation Central Docket Management Facility located in room PL-401 at the Plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. All docket material on the proposed statement will be available for inspection at this address and on the Internet at <http://doms.dot.gov>. (Docket hours at the Nassif Building are Monday-Friday, 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., excluding

Federal holidays.) Persons desiring notification that their comments have been received should submit a stamped, self-addressed postcard with their comments. The postcard will be returned to the addressee with a notation of the date on which the comments were received.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Gregory B. McBride, Deputy Chief Counsel, FTA, TCC-2, Room 9316, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590 (telephone: (202) 366-4063); and Daniel C. Smith, Assistant Chief Counsel for Safety, FRA, RCC-10, 1120 Vermont Avenue, NW, Mail Stop 10, Washington, DC 20590 (telephone: (202) 493-6029).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the proposed joint policy statement issued on May 25, 1999 by FRA and FTA, the agencies explained that the proposal is intended to delineate the nature of the most important safety issues related to shared use of the general railroad system by conventional and rail transit equipment and summarize the application of FRA safety rules to such shared-use operations. The proposal will help transit authorities, railroads, and other interested parties understand how the respective safety programs of the two agencies will be coordinated. The proposed statement noted that FRA soon intended to issue its own proposed statement of agency policy concerning its safety jurisdiction over railroad operations, which would discuss the extent and exercise of FRA's jurisdiction, provide guidance on which of FRA's safety rules are likely to apply in particular operational situations, and summarize how the process of obtaining waivers of FRA's safety regulations may work. The expectation of the two agencies was that commenters would then have the ability to study and analyze FRA's proposed policy statement before October 29, 1999, the revised deadline for submitting written comments on the proposed joint statement.

Since FRA has not yet issued its separate proposed policy statement, potential commenters will be unable to review that document before the close of the revised comment deadline for the proposed joint statement. Due to the complexity and importance of adopting a joint policy concerning shared use of the general railroad system by conventional railroads and light rail transit systems, especially to communities that are planning or developing light rail systems, FRA and FTA do not wish to inhibit the ability of any party to fully develop its comments and seek to provide sufficient

time for all interested parties to gather necessary information. Consequently, FRA and FTA believe it is in the best interest of all parties involved to extend the period for the submission of written comments in this proceeding to January 14, 2000, which is the anticipated deadline that FRA will set for submission of comments on its separate proposed statement of agency policy. FRA and FTA do not anticipate any further extension of the comment period in this proceeding. The two agencies will consider comments submitted after January 14, 2000, only to the extent possible without causing additional expense or delay.

Issued in Washington, DC, on October 25, 1999.

Jolene M. Molitoris,

Federal Railroad Administrator.

[FR Doc. 99-28350 Filed 10-28-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-99-6383]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1998 Jaguar XK-8 Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1998 Jaguar XK-8 passenger cars are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This document announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that a 1998 Jaguar XK-8 passenger car 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 November 29, 1999.

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 9 am to 5 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 of Lansdale, Pennsylvania ("Champagne") (Registered Importer 90-009) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether a 1998 Jaguar XK-8 passenger car is eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicle which Champagne believes is substantially similar is the 1998 Jaguar XK-8 passenger car 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 1998 Jaguar XK-8 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 1998 Jaguar XK-8, as originally manufactured, conforms to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards