

scoping meeting will be held on Thursday, January 25, 1996, 4:00 to 6:00 P.M., at the State Transportation Building, Mezzanine Level, Conference Room 4. See **ADDRESSES** below.

ADDRESSES: *Written comments* should be sent to Ms. Beth Rubenstein, Project Manager, MASSPORT Department of Transportation Planning and Construction, Logan Office Center, One Harborside Drive, Suite 200S, East Boston, MA 02128. *Scoping meeting* will be held at the following location: State Transportation Building, 10 Park Plaza, Boston, MA 02116, Mezzanine Level, Conference Room 4.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Mary Beth Mello, Deputy Regional Administrator, Federal Transit Administration, Region 1, (617) 494-2055.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Scoping

The FTA and MPA invite written comments for a period of 45 days after publication of this notice (see **DATES** and **ADDRESSES** above). During scoping, comments should focus on identifying specific social, economic, or environmental impacts to be evaluated, and suggested alternatives that are less costly or more environmentally beneficial and which achieve similar objectives. Comments should focus on the issues and alternatives for analysis, and not on a preference for a particular alternative. Individual preference for a particular alternative should be communicated during the comment period for the Draft EIS.

If you wish to be placed on the mailing list to receive further information as the project continues, contact Ms. Beth Rubenstein at the MPA (see **ADDRESS** above).

II. Description of Study Areas and Project Need

The proposed project consists of an analysis of alternatives to improve the connection between the MBTA transit system and Logan International Airport in East Boston, Massachusetts. The People Mover Alternative consists of fully automated electrically powered vehicles operating along a dedicated, elevated guideway system approximately 2.7 miles in length. The People Mover would replace the current shuttle bus service that connects passengers using public transit and Logan Airport terminals. The system will have the capacity to accommodate up to five times the existing number of airport passengers using the MBTA Airport Station. It will have fully climate controlled stations at the

MBTA's Blue Line Airport station and the terminal stations, with potential service to the rental car area and the water shuttle in future phases of the project. The project study area will focus on Logan Airport property, but project impacts within the boundary of Route 128 will be also be evaluated.

The People Mover Alternative would improve service and convenience for airport passengers, employees, and visitors accessing Logan via the MBTA and passengers traveling between terminals. The construction of the People Mover would complete the intermodal connection between the Boston region's mass transportation system and Logan Airport. The improved service and convenience afforded by this project is expected to support and facilitate increases in MBTA mode share and help contain or reduce environmental impacts associated with the anticipated growth in passenger levels at Logan in the years to come. It will provide improved on-airport circulation, better Blue Line station access, and a fast, frequent, reliable replacement for the fleets of shuttle buses that now add to the congestion on airport roads and at terminal curbs. Construction of the People Mover will result in fewer passenger vehicle trips, fewer vehicle miles traveled, lower diesel emissions, less roadway and curbside congestion, and more roadway capacity for other high occupancy modes. It is also expected to decrease regional air quality impacts and congestion associated with passenger and employee trips to Logan.

III. Alternatives

The alternatives proposed for evaluation include:

- (1) a Transportation Systems Management (TSM)/No-Build alternative, which involves additional buses and conversion of the fleet to clean fuels without construction of a People Mover;
- (2) construction of a People Mover Terminal Alignment system and refinements to the Terminal Alignment system, including stops at the MBTA Blue Line Airport Station and each of the airport terminal stations; and
- (3) consideration of a Blue Line Extension to the airport, which would bring MBTA Blue Line transit service directly onto airport property.

IV. Probable Effects/Potential Impacts for Analysis

The FTA and the MPA will evaluate all significant environmental, social, and economic impacts of the alternatives analyzed in the EIS. Impacts include changes in the natural

environment (air and water quality, rare and endangered species), changes in the social environment (land use and neighborhoods, noise and vibration, aesthetics, park lands, historic/archaeological resources), public safety and changes in the transit service and patronage. Project capital and operating costs and revenues will be estimated. The impacts will be evaluated for year 2010 with 37.5 million annual airline passengers (MAP), year 2010 with 45 MAP, and for opening year 2002 with 32 MAP. Measures to mitigate significant adverse impacts will be addressed.

V. FTA Procedures

In accordance with the Federal Transit Act, as amended, and with FTA policy, the Draft EIR/EIS will be prepared in conjunction with a Major Investment Study. After its publication, the Draft EIR/EIS/MIS will be available for public and agency review and comment, and a public hearing will be held. On the basis of the Draft EIR/EIS/MIS and the comments received, the MPA will select a preferred alternative, and will seek approval from FTA to continue with preparation of the Final EIR/EIS.

Issued on: January 17, 1996.

Richard H. Doyle,

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 96-740 Filed 1-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-57-P

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 95-49; Notice 2]

General Motors Corporation; Grant of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

General Motors Corporation (GM) of Warren, Michigan, determined that some of its vehicles failed to comply with the requirements of 49 CFR 571.108, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 108, "Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment," and filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports." GM also applied to be exempted from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301—"Motor Vehicle Safety" on the basis that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

Notice of receipt of the application was published on June 21, 1995, and an opportunity afforded for comment (60 FR 32391).

Turn signal lamps are required motor vehicle lighting equipment. Society of

Automotive Engineers' (SAE) Standard J588 NOV84, incorporated by reference in Table III of FMVSS No. 108 (and applicable to vehicles whose overall width is 80 inches or less), provides that the photometric requirements for turn signal lamps may be met at zones or groups of test points, instead of at each individual test point. Within a zone, the lamp is permitted to fail at individual test points as long as the total light intensity of all the test points within the zone is not below the specified level for the zone. SAE J588 specifies four such zones for turn signals.

From September 1990 through February 6, 1995, GM manufactured approximately 544,420 Buick Century passenger cars on which the turn signal lamps failed to meet the photometric requirements of SAE J588 NOV84. Of the four zones tested on the turn signal lamps, zones 1, 2, and 4 met the requirements, while zone 3 did not. The required light intensity for zone 3 is 2,375 candela (cd). When tested, 17 of the subject lamps produced, on average, a light intensity of approximately 2,145 cd or 90 percent of the required intensity. The three compliant zones exceed the light intensity requirements by at least 20 percent.

GM supported its application for inconsequential noncompliance with the following:

The difference between the FMVSS 108 requirement for zone 3 and the average performance of the subject lamps is imperceptible to the human eye. The average performance value for zone 3 for all 17 tested lamps is 10 percent below the 2375 cd federal requirement, and every lamp fell within 20 percent of that requirement (ranging from -1% to -18% of the requirement). As acknowledged in NHTSA's notices granting other similar petitions for determination of inconsequential noncompliance, and as demonstrated in the recent study (DOT HS 808 209, Final Report dated September 1994) sponsored by the agency, *Driver Perception of Just Noticeable Difference in Signal Lamp Intensities*, a change in luminous intensity of approximately 25 percent is required before the human eye can detect a difference between the two lamps. (See, e.g., Notice granting petition by Subaru of America (56 FR 59971); and Notice granting petition by Hella, Inc. (55 Fed. Reg. 37602).) Since the average discrepancy for the Buick lamp is only 10% with a maximum measured discrepancy of 18%, the subject lamps do not compromise motor vehicle safety as the noncompliance is not detectable by the human eye.

The subject lamps otherwise meet or exceed all other requirements of FMVSS 108, including the requirement of SAE J588, November 1984, that "the measured values at each test point shall not be less than 60% of the minimum value in Table 3 [Photometric Design Guidelines]."

GM is not aware of any accidents, injuries, owner complaints or field reports related to this condition.

No comments were received on the application.

Although the agency is troubled by the duration of the noncompliance and large number of affected vehicles, the criterion for granting an application is not the care or good faith of the applicant, but the effects of its noncompliance. The average noncompliance of the zone is only 10%, and this is offset by the three other zones exceeding the minima by 20%. On balance, then, the overall performance of the turn signal lamps will be consistent with that of lamps meeting the minimum requirements in every zone.

For the foregoing reasons, it is hereby found that the applicant has met its burden of persuasion that the noncompliance herein described is inconsequential to safety. Accordingly, the applicant is exempted from its obligation to provide notice of the noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30118, and to remedy the noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30120.

(49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8)

Issued on: January 17, 1996.

Barry Felrice,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 96-712 Filed 1-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-M

[Docket No. 95-91; Notice 2]

Decision That Nonconforming 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300SL Passenger Cars are Eligible for Importation

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

ACTION: Notice of decision by NHTSA that nonconforming 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300SL passenger cars are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the decision by NHTSA that 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300SL 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 a vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States and certified by its manufacturer as complying with the safety standards (the U.S.-certified version of the 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300SL), and they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: This decision is effective as of January 22, 1996.

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) (formerly section 108(c)(3)(A)(i) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act (the Act)), 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 (formerly section 114 of the Act), 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.

Liphardt & Associates, Inc. of Ronkonkoma, New York (Registered Importer R-90-004) petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300SL passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. NHTSA published notice of the petition on November 13, 1995 (60 FR 57054) to afford an opportunity for public comment. The reader is referred to that notice for a thorough description of the petition. No comments were received in response to the notice. Based on its review of the information submitted by the petitioner, NHTSA has decided to grant the petition.

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