and Section 106 Finding of No Adverse Effect. *Supporting documentation:* Environmental Assessment issued April 4, 2005.

5. *Project name and location:* Lakewood-to-Tacoma Sounder Commuter Rail, Tacoma, WA. *Project sponsor:* Sound Transit. *Project description:* Commuter rail facilities along an approximately 12-mile rail corridor between the City of Lakewood and the City of Tacoma. *Final agency actions:* ROD issued December 30, 2003; Section 4(f) Finding; and Section 106 Finding of No Adverse Effect. *Supporting documentation:* Final Environmental Impact Statement issued July 5, 2002.

6. *Project name and location:* Erie Canal Harbor Project, Buffalo, NY. *Project sponsors:* Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority and Empire State Development Corporation. *Project description:* Reconfiguration of a portion of the Buffalo River bulkhead and redevelopment of a site within the City's Waterfront Development Project Urban Renewal Area into a new harbor with series of landside improvements to facilitate and enhance public access to the waterfront, connect pedestrian and bicycle paths, and provide opportunities for private development. *Final agency actions:* Revised ROD issued March 2, 2005; Section 4(f) Finding; and Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. *Supporting documentation:* Supplemental Final Environmental Impact Statement issued December 7, 2004.

7. *Project name and location:* Second Avenue Subway, New York, NY. *Project sponsors:* Metropolitan Transportation Authority and New York City Transit. *Project description:* A new subway line extending the length of Manhattan's East Side from 125th Street in East Harlem to Hanover Square in the Financial District. *Final agency actions:* ROD issued July 8, 2004; Section 4(f) Finding; and Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. *Supporting documentation:* Final Environmental Impact Statement issued April 8, 2004.

8. *Project name and location:* East Side Access Project, New York, NY. *Project sponsors:* Metropolitan Transportation Authority and the Long Island Railroad. *Project description:* Construction of new tunnels in Queens and Manhattan that will bring Long Island Railroad trains into a new terminal beneath Grand Central Terminal on the east side of Manhattan. *Final agency actions:* ROD issued May 21, 2001; Section 4(f) Finding; and Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. *Supporting documentation:* Final Environmental Impact Statement issued March 6, 2001.

9. *Project name and location:* South County Commuter Rail, Providence, RI. *Project sponsor:* Rhode Island Department of Transportation. *Project description:* 20-mile commuter rail extension along Amtrak's Northeast Corridor from Providence to North Kingston. *Final agency actions:* FONSI issued on February 6, 2003; Section 4(f) Finding; and Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. *Supporting documentation:* Environmental Assessment issued on August 3, 2002.

10. *Project name and location:* New Britain-Hartford Busway, Hartford, CT. *Project sponsor:* Connecticut Department of Transportation. *Project description:* 12-station, 9.4 mile exclusive bus rapid transit system operating primarily in an existing and abandoned railroad right-of-way on a new roadway between downtown New Britain and downtown Hartford. *Final agency actions:* ROD issued on March 13, 2002; Section 4(f) Finding; and Section 106 Finding of No Effect. *Supporting documentation:* Final Environmental Impact Statement issued on December 21, 2001.

11. *Project name and location:* Copley Station Accessibility Improvements, Boston, MA. *Project sponsor:* Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA). *Project description:* Reconstruction of Copley Station on MBTA's Green Line to make it compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act. *Final agency actions:* FONSI issued on December 30, 2004; Section 4(f) Finding; and Section 106 Finding of No Adverse Effect. *Supporting documentation:* Environmental Assessment issued on June 28, 2004.

12. *Project name and location:* Arlington Street Station Accessibility Improvements, Boston, MA. *Project sponsor:* Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA). *Project description:* Reconstruction of Arlington Street Station on MBTA's Green Line to make it compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act. *Final agency actions:* FONSI issued on May 14, 2004; Section 4(f) Finding; and Section 106 Finding of No Adverse Effect. *Supporting documentation:* Environmental Assessment issued on July 21, 2003.

13. *Project name and location:* Government Station Accessibility Improvements, Boston, MA. *Project sponsor:* Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA). *Project description:* Reconstruction of Government Station on MBTA's Blue and Green Lines to make it compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act. *Final agency actions:* FONSI issued on November 29, 2004; Section 4(f) Finding; and Section 106 Finding of No Adverse Effect. *Supporting documentation:* Environmental Assessment issued in July 2002.

14. *Project name and location:* Brattleboro Multimodal Transit Facility, Brattleboro, VT. *Project sponsor:* Town of Brattleboro. *Project description:* Construction of two transportation facilities, the Brattleboro Transportation Center and the Brattleboro Union Station. *Final agency actions:* FONSI issued on September 14, 2001; Section 4(f) Finding; and Section 106 Finding of No Adverse Effect. *Supporting documentation:* Environmental Assessment issued on June 22, 2001.

15. *Project name and location:* Bridgeport Intermodal Transportation Center, Bridgeport, CT. *Project sponsor:* City of Bridgeport. *Project description:* Construction of a new multimodal transportation center in the downtown. *Final agency actions:* FONSI issued on August 19, 2003; Section 4(f) Finding; and Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement. *Supporting documentation:* Environmental Assessment issued on June 17, 2003.

Issued on: February 24, 2006.

David J. Vozzolo,

Acting Associate Administrator for Planning and Environment, Washington, DC.

[FR Doc. E6–2924 Filed 2–28–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–57–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

Relocation and Decommissioning of NS Savannah

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Notice and Request for Comments.

SUMMARY: The Maritime Administration (MARAD) is considering transferring the Nuclear Ship NS *Savannah* from its present location in the James River Reserve Fleet in Virginia to either Charleston, South Carolina; Wilmington, North Carolina; Hampton Roads, Virginia; or Baltimore, Maryland, to complete decommissioning of the ship's nuclear reactor. Prior to making this decision, MARAD requests public comments and may hold several informational public meetings and/or teleconferences on the proposal.

DATES: Comments are due by March 31, 2006.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by mail to: Maritime Administration, Office of Congressional and Public Affairs, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590; or by e-mail to: *pao.marad@dot.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Erhard Koehler, Manager, NS *Savannah* Programs, Maritime Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590; phone: (202) 366–2631; fax: (202) 366–3954; or e-mail *Erhard.Koehler@dot.gov*. Information regarding the NS *Savannah* is also available on MARAD's Web site at *http://www.marad.dot.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The NS *Savannah*, the world's first nuclear-powered commercial vessel, was originally launched on July 21, 1959, and served as a demonstration of the peaceful and productive use of atomic power. It was part of the Patriots Point Naval and Maritime Museum in Mount Pleasant, SC from 1981 to 1994, and has spent the last 11 years moored at MARAD's James River Reserve Fleet in Virginia.

MARAD is considering transferring the *Savannah* from its present location to either Charleston, South Carolina; Wilmington, North Carolina; Hampton Roads, Virginia; or Baltimore, Maryland, to complete the decommissioning of its nuclear reactor. No nuclear fuel remains on the *Savannah* (as all of the fuel was removed more than 30 years ago). MARAD has a five-year plan to remove the rest of the irradiated components from the ship—the reactor pressure vessel, steam generators, pumps and piping systems. These components have been tested and found to be Class A or lower, which means they have the lowest radiation levels they can have and still be considered nuclear waste. The waste would be disposed of in a licensed facility. This collective process is defined as ''decommissioning.''

The *Savannah* is licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)—just like any other commercial utility that operates a nuclear power station. Under NRC regulations, MARAD must move the *Savannah* from its present location in the James River Reserve Fleet to an East Coast port / industrial complex where the decommissioning work can be accomplished. NRC will then consider an amendment to MARAD's *Savannah* license to authorize the decommissioning work. This review is expected to take two years (2006–2008), and it will include a series of formal hearings chaired by the NRC in the decommissioning port.

MARAD is requesting public comments on its proposal to relocate the *Savannah* for decommissioning. After reviewing comments, MARAD may hold several informational public meetings (and/or teleconferences) addressing this proposal in Charleston, South Carolina; Wilmington, North Carolina; Hampton Roads, Virginia (to include Norfolk, Portsmouth, Newport News); and Baltimore, Maryland. If such meetings are determined to be necessary, specific dates and times for the meetings will be announced in the **Federal Register**.

(Authority 49 CFR 1.66)

Dated: February 24, 2006.

By order of the Maritime Administrator.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary, Maritime Administration

[FR Doc. E6–2923 Filed 2–28–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA 2005–22654; Notice 2]

Final Decision To Partially Rescind Decision That Nonconforming 1990–1999 Nissan GTS and GTR Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

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

ACTION: Final decision to partially rescind decision that nonconforming 1990–1999 Nissan GTS and GTR passenger cars are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This document announces a final decision by NHTSA to partially rescind a prior decision by the agency that 1990–1999 Nissan GTS and GTR passenger cars not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards (FMVSS) are eligible for importation into the United States. As a result of this decision, only Nissan R33 model GTS and GTR passenger cars manufactured between January 1996 and June 1998 are eligible for importation. All other model and model year vehicles admissible under the prior decision are no longer eligible for importation. As a consequence, the agency is rescinding vehicle eligibility number VCP–17, which covered vehicles admissible under the prior decision, and issuing vehicle eligibility number VCP–32 to cover only those model and model year Nissan GTS and GTR passenger cars that remain eligible for importation. The rescission will only bar the future importation of the model and model year Nissan GTS and GTR passenger cars that are no longer eligible for importation, and will not affect the status of vehicles that have already been lawfully imported under vehicle eligibility number VCP–17.

DATES: The decision is effective on March 1, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Coleman Sachs, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590 (202–366–5291).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Statutory and Regulatory 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. Where there is no substantially similar U.S.-certified motor vehicle, 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(B) permits a nonconforming motor vehicle to be admitted into the United States if its safety features comply with, or are capable of being altered to comply with, all applicable FMVSS based on crash test data or other evidence (such as an engineering analysis) that NHTSA decides is adequate.

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. Because NHTSA has little or no direct knowledge of many vehicles for which import eligibility is sought, the agency must rely on the petition and any comments that are submitted in making this decision. The agency then publishes its decision in the **Federal Register**. If NHTSA decides that the vehicle is eligible for importation, it will assign a vehicle eligibility number. The eligibility