alternative. Trips from outside the I–285 perimeter destined to Atlanta would be particularly well served by the project. The travel forecasts predicted over 13,800 daily transit boardings at the proposed Fulton Industrial station. ARC's Regional Transportation Plan, 2025 (RTP) also documents the existing and future travel patterns and levels of congestion within the corridor. The RTP lists planned transportation improvements including widening and addition of HOV lanes on I–20 and numerous surface street improvements. Even with those improvements, the RTP sites the expected continued increase in levels of congestion. The RTP also forecasts that substantial ridership can be attributed to extended transit service beyond the existing West Line terminus at Hamilton E. Holmes Station.

The Fulton Industrial Boulevard area is also developing into a major employment center for many MARTA service area residents, which requires a commute from the central area of Atlanta, South Fulton County and DeKalb County. A reduction in travel time to the Fulton Industrial Area could encourage a substantial increase in reverse commutes on the MARTA System.

III. Alternatives To Be Studied

An Alternatives Analysis will identify the transit service options for reconsideration, in detail, during the NEPA process. The alternatives expected to be considered in detail in the EIS include:

A no-build or no-action alternative that includes only those projects already committed as defined in the current Regional Long Range Transportation Plan.

A TSM Alternative that represents low cost infrastructure improvements and bus transit enhancements to the service already provided in the study area, including projects already committed as defined in the current Regional Long Range Transportation Plan.

A number of fixed guideway improvements along multiple alignments including, but not limited to, a heavy rail extension of the current MARTA West Line, bus rapid transit and light rail transit facilities. These alternatives would also include all facilities associated with the construction and operation of transit systems including right of way, structures, track (if necessary), stations, park and ride lots, storage and maintenance facilities and respective bus and rail operating plans.

IV. Probable Effects

The EIS will be prepared in accordance with NEPA and its implementing regulations (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), and the FTA regulation on environmental procedures shared with the Federal Highway Administration (23 CFR part 771). The EIS will evaluate the social (including environmental justice benefits and burdens analysis), economic, and environmental impacts of the alternatives. Primary concerns to be addressed include: safety at grade crossings, site contamination in railroad rights-of-way, property effects including business disruptions and relocation, impacts on local traffic and travel patterns, noise and vibration impacts, land use impacts, wetland impacts, and aesthetic/visual impacts. The cumulative impacts of the project together with other reasonably foreseeable actions and activities will be addressed.

V. FTA New Starts Procedures

Following public review of the Draft EIS, MARTA will request FTA approval to initiate Preliminary Engineering, in accordance with the FTA New Starts regulation (49 CFR part 611). FTA will consider the merits of the project in comparison with other projects across the nation competing for New Starts funding. FTA will either recommend or not recommend the preferred alternative's advancement into Preliminary Engineering.

Issued on: October 31, 2002.

Jerry Franklin,

Regional Administrator, Atlanta, Georgia.

[FR Doc. 02–28244 Filed 11–5–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–57–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

Environmental Impact Statement for the Salt Lake City—Weber County Regional Transportation Corridor Project

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), in cooperation with the Utah Transit Authority (UTA), is issuing this notice to advise interested agencies and the public that, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared for the proposed Salt Lake City—Weber County Regional Transportation Corridor project located in Weber, Davis, and Salt Lake Counties, Utah. An Environmental Impact Statement will be prepared to evaluate transportation improvements, including a potential commuter rail line, in the Salt Lake City-Weber County Regional Transportation Corridor.

A commuter rail transit alternative (*i.e.*, the Build Alternative), a No-Build Alternative, and any additional alternatives emerging from the Scoping Process will be evaluated. The EIS will consider any reasonable alternatives identified during scoping that provide similar transportation benefits while reducing or avoiding adverse impacts. Scoping will be accomplished through coordination with interested persons, organizations, and federal, state and local agencies. Three (3) public scoping meetings, one meeting in each of the three counties, and one (1) interagency scoping meeting are currently planned.

Based on the results of the Scoping Process, FTA will make the following determinations regarding the environmental review under NEPA:

1. Identification of environmental issues to be addressed;

2. Refinement of the alternatives for evaluation.

DATES: Public and agency scoping meetings will be held November 15 to 22, 2002.

Agency Scoping Meeting: November 15, 2002.

Public Scoping Meeting: November 19, 2002.

Public Scoping Meeting: November 20, 2002.

Public Scoping Meeting: November 21, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on the project should be sent to Michelle Rust, Strategic Planner, Utah Transit Authority, 3600 South 700 West, Salt Lake City, Utah 84130 (801) 262–5626, ext. 3255.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Don Cover, Federal Transit Administration, 216–16th Street, Suite 650, Denver, Colorado 80202. Phone: (303)844–2174.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Scoping

UTA will hold the Interagency Scoping meeting November 15, 2002 from 8:30 A.M to 10:30 A.M. at UTA's Meadowbrook Offices, in the Board Room, located at 3600 South 700 West, Salt Lake City, UT 84130. This location is accessible to individuals with disabilities. Individuals with special needs should contact Sherry L. Repscher, ADA Compliance Officer,

UTA, 3600 South 700 West, Salt Lake City, Utah 84130 (801)-262–5626.

UTA will hold the following Public Scoping Meetings:

1. November 19, 2002 from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. at the Davis County Library-North Branch located at 562 South 1000 East, Clearfield, UT 84015. This location is accessible to individuals with disabilities. Individuals with special needs should contact Sherry L. Repscher, ADA Compliance Officer, UTA, 3600 South 700 West, Salt Lake City, Utah 84130 (801)–262–5626.

2. November 20, 2002 from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. at the Union Pacific Depot at the Gateway, located at 450 West 100 South, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101. The meeting location is service by the UTA TRAX Delta Center Station and is accessible to individuals with disabilities.

3. November 21, 2002 from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. at the Ogden Union Station located at 2501 Wall Avenue, Ogden, Utah 84401. This location is also accessible to individuals with disabilities.

Interested individuals, organizations, and public agencies are invited to attend the Scoping Meetings. The purpose of the Scoping Meetings is: (1) To determine the scope of the NEPA evaluation including the identification of significant environmental or community issues and alternatives that would reduce or eliminate adverse impacts; and (2) to eliminate issues which are not significant or which have already been evaluated by the prior environmental review, the Inter-Regional Corridor Alternatives Analysis. An information packet, referred to as the Scoping Booklet, will be distributed to all public agencies and interested individuals and will be available at the meetings. Others may request the Scoping Booklet by contacting Michelle Rust of UTA at the address listed above in **ADDRESSES**.

If you wish to be placed on the mailing list to receive further information as the project develops, contact: Michelle Rust, Strategic Planner, Utah Transit Authority, 3600 South 700 West, Salt Lake City, Utah 84130 (801) 262–5626, ext. 3255.

II. Description of the Study Area and Project Need

The Weber County to Salt Lake City project corridor is centered on an existing rail corridor through Weber, Davis, and Salt Lake Counties. During the preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) UTA plans to submit an initial section 5309 New Starts evaluation to FTA in accordance with 49 CFR part 611, and request FTA approval to initiate Preliminary Engineering for the proposed commuter rail line. The Final EIS will reflect the results of Preliminary Engineering.

Recent passage of a ¼ cent regional sales tax increase indicates broad public support for expansion and improvement of transit services throughout Weber, Salt Lake, and Davis Counties. The project has undergone more than five years of planning and alternatives analysis conducted by the two Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) and Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG), in association with UDOT and UTA. It has been included in the financially constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan most recently adopted by WFRC, in September 2001.

III. Alternatives

The Utah Transit Authority, the Wasatch Front Regional Council, the Mountainlands Association of Governments, and the Utah Department of Transportation conducted an alternatives analysis entitled the Inter-Regional Corridor Alternatives Analysis which looked at transit alternatives in a corridor from Brigham City to Payson in Utah. The alternatives considered included commuter rail, light rail and express bus. While the corridor covered by the Inter-Regional Corridor Alternatives Analysis was longer than the project proposed, the Study did completely encompass the Salt Lake City to Weber County corridor now being studied and recommended that the Commuter Rail Alternative be pursued. The Inter-Regional Corridor Alternatives Analysis (IRCAA) concluded that light rail and bus alternatives should be eliminated from further consideration. The analysis of the IRCAA will be incorporated into the EIS. During Scoping, that document is available for public review by contacting Michelle Rust of UTA at the address and phone number given above in **ADDRESSES**.

UTA and FTA are planning to evaluate the following two alternatives (and any others that emerge as the result of scoping) in the EIS:

- *No Build Alternative:* This alternative assumes that there will be no change in transportation services or facilities in the corridor beyond already committed projects. It includes the highway and transit improvements defined in the two MPOs' financially constrained Long-Range Transportation Plans but with the proposed commuter rail project removed and replaced by bus service comparable to the bus service levels in other similar parts of the metropolitan area. It includes the recently completed Intermodal Center in Ogden and the Intermodal Center in Salt Lake City, which is under development.
- *Build Alternative:* The Build Alternative consists of new commuter rail service from northern Weber County, through the recently completed Intermodal Center in Ogden to the Intermodal Center in Salt Lake City, which is under development. Intermediate stops are planned along the route. Ridership and costs have been estimated with the assumption that peak period and off-peak service would be provided in both directions along the line, even though the majority of the line will have single track. The distance between Ogden and Salt Lake City is approximately 37 miles.

IV. Probable Effects/Potential Impacts for Analysis

Among the primary transit issues to be evaluated are the effects on transit ridership and mobility for the corridor's transit dependent residents, the role of the project in a regional transit network that supports the region's air quality goals, capital outlays needed to construct the project, cost of operating and maintaining the facilities created by the project, and the financial impacts on the funding agencies.

In accordance with NEPA, the impacts on potentially affected environmental and social resources will be considered, including land use and neighborhood impacts, residential and business displacements and relocations, traffic and parking impacts near stations, traffic circulation, visual impacts, impacts on cultural and archaeological resources, and noise and vibration impacts. Impacts on air and water quality, groundwater, hazardous waste sites, and water resources will also be examined. The impacts will be evaluated both for the construction period and for the long-term period of operation to include direct, indirect, and cumulative analysis. Measures to mitigate adverse impacts will be considered.

V. FTA Procedures

The EIS will be prepared in accordance with NEPA and its implementing regulations including those of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) implementing NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), and the FTA regulation on environmental procedures shared with the Federal Highway Administration (23 CFR part 771). The NEPA process will also be used to comply with the requirements of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (CAAA) and with Executive Order

12898 on Environmental Justice. After publication, the draft NEPA document will be available for comment by the public and other agencies. The final NEPA review will consider the public and agency comments received during the public circulation of the draft EIS, will refine the project as appropriate in response to the comments, will continue with Preliminary Engineering of the Project, and will develop the preferred alternative, including committed mitigation measures. Opportunity for additional public comment will be provided throughout all phases of the project development, and will be announced through the mailing list, on the project website, or by other means.

Issued on: October 30, 2002.

Lee O. Waddleton,

Regional Administrator, Federal Transit Administration.

[FR Doc. 02–28245 Filed 11–5–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–57–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2001–10526; Notice 2]

Decision That Nonconforming 1999 Ferrari F355 Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

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

ACTION: Notice of decision by NHTSA that nonconforming 1999 Ferrari F355 passenger cars are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This document announces the decision by NHTSA that 1999 Ferrari F355 passenger cars 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 sale in the United States and certified by their manufacturer as complying with the safety standards (the U.S. certified version of the 1999 Ferrari F355), and they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: This decision is effective as of the date of its publication in the **Federal Register**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Luke Loy, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202–366–5308).

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 (''FMVSS'') 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 FMVSS.

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**.

J.K. Technologies, LLC, of Baltimore, MD, (''J.K.'') (Registered Importer 90–006) petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1999 Ferrari F355 passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. NHTSA published notice of the petition on September 24, 2001 (66 FR 48905) to afford an opportunity for public comment. The reader is referred to that notice for a thorough description of the petition.

Three comments were received in response to the notice of the petition. Only one of these, from Ferrari North America (FNA), the U.S. representative of the vehicle's manufacturer, provided substantive technical information relating to the petition. The other comments were in favor of granting the petition, with one party identifying a recall that would need to be addressed. The FNA comments and subsequent responses from J.K. and FNA with respect to each FMVSS that the comments addressed are discussed below.

Standard Nos. 208—Occupant Crash Protection, and 209—Seat Belt Assemblies

On October 24, 2001, FNA stated that J.K. failed to note differences between the U.S.-certified 1999 Ferrari F355 and non-U.S. certified versions of the vehicle with respect to 12 parts directly relating to Standard No. 208 and/or Standard No. 209. FNA stated that the seat belts in the U.S. version are different from those in the non-U.S. version with respect to labeling and the child seat ratchet mechanism. On April 11, 2002, J.K. stated that all modified vehicles will have the U.S. parts for all seat belt components and thus will comply with Standard Nos. 208 and 209. On May 6, 2002, FNA stated that NHTSA should condition the importation of non-U.S. certified 1999 Ferrari F355 passenger cars on a requirement that registered importers (RIs) replace any non-U.S. model parts related to Standard Nos. 208 and 209 with U.S. model parts. On June 3, 2002, J.K. agreed and reiterated that all components would be inspected for U.S. part numbers and, where necessary, U.S. parts will be installed.

Standard No. 214—Side Impact Protection

On October 24, 2001, FNA stated that only U.S. and Canadian versions of the 1999 Ferrari F355 were equipped with specially designed door beams that are needed to meet this standard. FNA stated that there was no practical method of installing door beams on the outside of the door frame, as was done on the U.S. certified version of the vehicle, without major disassembly of the door. FNA also stated that the door beam material was not available from FNA, as J.K. had claimed in the petition. FNA contended that the only way to achieve compliance with Standard No. 214 was to completely replace both the driver and passenger doors.

On April 11, 2002, J.K. responded that there are two ways to bring the non-U.S. certified 1999 Ferrari F355 into compliance with this standard: one method is to replace the non-U.S. model doors with U.S. model doors, as suggested by FNA; and the second method is to modify the non-U.S. model doors by installation of a door beam. [1] J.K. stated that beam stock that is identical to the door beam stock that Ferrari installs in the U.S. door is available from Ferrari's supplier. J.K. stated that the door beams can be installed from inside the door and mounted on the stock mounts, and asserted that the finished product would have door beam installations that are

[1] We note that for purposes of determining eligibility for importation, replacement of a door is a simple modification that clearly would meet the criteria of 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A)(iv). However, J.K. stated that it would prefer to modify the vehicle by installing an additional door beam, since that would be far less expensive.