

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Larry R. Dreihaupt, P.E., Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Suite 17T100, Atlanta, Georgia 30303, Telephone (404) 562-3630; or David E. Studstill, State Environmental/Location Engineer, Georgia Department of Transportation, Office of Environmental/Location, 3993 Aviation Circle, Atlanta, Georgia 30336, Telephone (404) 699-4401.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), will prepare a supplemental draft EIS on a proposal to construct a four-lane limited access highway on new location from the terminus of the existing Phase I segment at Derenne Avenue to the Abercorn Street extension. The project length is approximately 10.3 km. The proposed project is necessary to provide additional capacity to mitigate congestion for north-south traffic on the east side of Savannah.

A draft EIS for this project was approved on February 20, 1997; however, due to a recent discovery of an active bald eagle's nest near the applicant's preferred alternate, a supplemental draft EIS will be prepared. Letters describing this action and soliciting comments will be sent to the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies. A public hearing will be held and a public notice will be given of the time and place of the hearing. Comments or questions concerning the supplemental draft EIS should be directed to the FHWA at the address provided above.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Research, Planning and Construction. Georgia's approved clearinghouse review procedures apply to this program)

Issued on: March 18, 1997.

Marvin Woodward,

Transportation Manager, Atlanta, Georgia.

[FR Doc. 97-8549 Filed 4-2-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-M

**Environmental Impact Statement:
Yankton County, South Dakota and
Cedar County, Nebraska**

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 bridge project between Cedar County, Nebraska and Yankton County, South Dakota.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Edward Kosola, Realty Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Federal Building, Room 220, 100 Centennial Mall North, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508, Telephone: (402) 437-5521. Mr. Arthur Yonkey, Project Development Engineer, Nebraska Department of Roads, P.O. Box 94759, Lincoln, Nebraska 68509, Telephone: (402) 479-4795. Mr. Tim Bjorneberg, Chief Road Design Engineer, South Dakota Department of Transportation, Transportation Building, 700 East Broadway, Pierre, South Dakota 57501, Telephone: (605) 773-3433.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the Nebraska Department of Roads, the South Dakota Department of Transportation, and the City of Yankton, South Dakota, will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for a proposal to construct a bridge over the Missouri River. The proposed project would connect Yankton County, South Dakota and Cedar County, Nebraska, in the vicinity of Yankton, South Dakota.

Alternatives under consideration include: (1) taking no action; (2) replacing the US 81 Bridge on the existing alignment; and (3) providing a new crossing upstream or downstream from the existing alignment.

The US 81 Bridge has been listed as a historic landmark in the National Register of Historic Places. The existing bridge consists of two concrete decks; the upper deck providing one lane of northbound traffic into Yankton and the lower deck serving one lane of southbound traffic into Cedar County, Nebraska.

An agency scoping meeting was held on December 10, 1996 and a public scoping meeting is planned. A Draft EIS will be prepared and a public hearing will be held. Public notice will be given of the public scoping meeting and public hearing.

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 and questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS should be directed to the FHWA or the Nebraska Department of Roads at the address provided.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Project 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)

Edward Kosola,

Realty Officer, Nebraska Division, Federal Highway Administration, Lincoln, Nebraska.

[FR Doc. 97-8511 Filed 4-2-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-M

**National Highway Traffic Safety
Administration**

[Docket No. 97-03; Notice 2]

**Decision That Nonconforming 1987
and 1988 Toyota Van Multi-Purpose
Passenger Vehicles are Eligible for
Importation**

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

ACTION: Notice of decision by NHTSA that nonconforming 1987 and 1988 Toyota Van multi-purpose passenger vehicles (MPVs) are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the decision by NHTSA that 1987 and 1988 Toyota Van MPVs 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 1987 and 1988 Toyota Van MPVs), and they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: This decision is effective as of April 3, 1997.

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**.

J.K. Motors of Kingsville, Maryland (Registered Importer R-90-006) petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1987 and 1988 Toyota Van MPVs are eligible for importation into the United States. NHTSA published notice of the petition on January 27, 1997 (62 FR 3940) 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 number indicating that the vehicle is eligible for entry. VSP-200 is the vehicle eligibility number assigned to vehicles admissible under this decision.

Final Decision

Accordingly, on the basis of the foregoing, NHTSA hereby decides that 1987 and 1988 Toyota Van MPVs not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are substantially similar to 1987 and 1988 Toyota Van MPVs originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States and certified under 49 U.S.C. § 30115, and are capable of being readily altered to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A) and (b)(1); 49 CFR 593.8; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on: March 27, 1997.

Marilynne Jacobs,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.
[FR Doc. 97-8522 Filed 4-2-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

[Docket No. 96-129; Notice 2]

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

This notice grants the application by General Motors Corporation (GM) of Warren, Michigan, to be exempted from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. 30118(d), and 30120(h) for a noncompliance with 49 CFR 571.108, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 108, "Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment." The basis of the application is that the noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety.

Notice of receipt of the application was published on December 18, 1996, and an opportunity afforded for comment (61 FR 66744).

Paragraph S5.5.11(a)(2) of FMVSS No. 108 requires that any pair of lamps on the front of a passenger car, * * * other than parking lamps or fog lamps, may be wired to be automatically activated, as determined by the manufacturer of the vehicle, * * * provided that each such lamp is permanently marked "DRL" on its lens in letters not less than 3 mm high, unless it is optically combined with a headlamp.

GM's description of the noncompliance follows:

GM recently discovered that the combination park/turn signal lamp for the 1997 Pontiac Firebird vehicles had been released without the required "DRL" marking on the face of the lamp. The condition was corrected in September 1996. Approximately 4,500 vehicles were produced without "DRL" marked on the lamps.

GM supported its application for inconsequential noncompliance with the following reasons:

The park/turn signal lamps meet all substantive requirements of FMVSS 108 for all functions; the sole noncompliance concerns the marking on the lamps for the voluntary DRL function.

NHTSA adopted a lens marking requirement in the final rule promulgating DRL provisions because of a concern that state enforcement and vehicle inspection officials would not be able to "distinguish between legal and illegal lamps and lamp combinations in the absence of marking." 58 Fed. Reg. 3504 (1993).

While NHTSA adopted "DRL" as the required marking, it had considered an alternate proposal to adopt the "Y2" identification code specified in SAE Recommended Practice J759, Lighting Identification Code, January 1995 (SAE J579).

The agency chose to require the "DRL" marking apparently not because of a state inspection concern, but because the SAE specifications were not identical to the federal ones. NHTSA reasoned that "to adopt the SAE designation would be inaccurate and confusing because it would signify adoption of the SAE requirements * * *." Id.

In this instance, the subject vehicles include the "Y2" marking specified by SAE J759. Thus, while the lamps do not meet the explicit federal marking requirements, they do provide an indication to state officials that the lamps are intended to be used as DRLs. Moreover, the concern expressed by NHTSA in the final rule about the SAE designation does not apply here since the subject lamps meet the substantive requirements of both FMVSS 108 and SAE J759.

The owner's manual for the Firebird explains that the DRL function is provided by the park/turn signal lamp. A state inspector who is unclear about the "Y2" designation would have alternate means of confirming that the turn signal portion of the lamp properly provides a DRL function.

The population of subject vehicles is small, so any confusion created by the condition would be minimal.

GM is not aware of any customer complaints concerning the absence of the "DRL" marking.

No comments were received on the application.

Discussion and Recommendation

The agency has carefully reviewed GM's analyses. Because the lens marking requirement was initially promulgated by the agency to enable state enforcement and vehicle inspection officials to distinguish between legal and illegal lamps and lamp combinations, NHTSA believes that the omission of the "DRL" marking will not compromise motor vehicle safety for the reasons expressed by GM.

Accordingly, for the reasons expressed above, the petitioner has met its burden of persuasion that the noncompliance herein described is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and the agency grants GM's application for exemption from notification of the noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30118 and from remedy 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: March 31, 1997.

L. Robert Shelton,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 97-8537 Filed 4-2-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P