due to the previous removal of the siding.

BS–AP–No. 3433

Applicant: Soo Line Railroad Company, Mr. M. S. Hanson, District Manager Engineering Services, Canadian Pacific Railway, 105 South 5th Street, Box 530, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55440.

The Soo Line Railroad Company seeks approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of the automatic block signal system, on the single main track, between Preston Interlocking and Belt Junction Interlocking, and Belt Junction Interlocking and Spring Hill Interlocking, near Terre Haute, Indiana, on the Latta Subdivision, including installation of fixed approach signals.

The reason given for the proposed changes is to eliminate facilities no longer required for present day operation, as the only freight service on the line is one local, six days a week.

BS–AP–No. 3434

Applicants: South Kansas & Oklahoma Railroad and Kansas Eastern Railroad, Mr. David L. Buccolo, Vice President Rules and Safety, 315 West Third, Pittsburg, Kansas 66762.

The South Kansas & Oklahoma Railroad (SKOL) and the Kansas Eastern Railroad (KE) jointly seek approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of automatic interlocking signals 1553 and 1554, at Cherryvale, Kansas, where a single main track of the SKOL, Tulsa Subdivision, milepost 155.6, crosses at grade, a single main track of the KE, Neodesha Subdivision, milepost 386.8. The proposal includes removal of the automatic gate mechanism, retaining a manual gate to be left lined for the last train movement.

The reasons given for the proposed changes are that the equipment is antiquated and replacement parts are almost impossible to obtain, it will reduce unnecessary maintenance expense, train operations in the area have changed and SKOL and KE are now joint operating lines, and also help avoid delays and unnecessary blockages of the highway road crossings in the area.

Any interested party desiring to protest the granting of an application shall set forth specifically the grounds upon which the protest is made, and contain a concise statement of the interest of the protestant in the proceeding. The original and two copies of the protest shall be filed with the Associate Administrator for Safety, FRA, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Mail Stop 25, Washington, DC 20590 within 45 calendar days of the date of issuance of this notice. Additionally, one copy of the protest shall be furnished to the applicant at the address listed above.

FRA expects to be able to determine these matters without an oral hearing. However, if a specific request for an oral hearing is accompanied by a showing that the party is unable to adequately present his or her position by written statements, an application may be set for public hearing.

Issued in Washington, DC on July 29, 1997.

Grady C. Cothen, Jr.,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Standards and Program Development.

[FR Doc. 97–20515 Filed 8–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 97–049; Notice 1]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1988–1989 Audi 80 Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1988–1989 Audi 80 passenger cars are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This notice announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that 1988–1989 Audi 80 passenger cars that were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are eligible for importation into the United States because (1) They are substantially similar to vehicles that were originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States and that were certified by their manufacturer as complying with the safety standards, and (2) they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the petition is September 4, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to the docket number and notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Section, Room 5109, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590. [Docket hours are from 9:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.].

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)(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**.

Champagne Imports, Inc. of Lansdale, Pennsylvania (''Champagne'') (Registered Importer 90–009) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1988–1989 Audi 80 passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles which Champagne believes are substantially similar are 1988–1989 Audi 80 passenger cars that were manufactured for importation into, and sale in, the United States and certified by their manufacturer as conforming to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared non-U.S. certified 1988–1989 Audi 80 passenger cars to their U.S. certified counterpart, and found the 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 non-U.S. certified 1988–1989 Audi 80 passenger cars, as originally manufactured, conform to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as their U.S. certified counterparts, or are

capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that non-U.S. certified 1988–1989 Audi 80 passenger cars are identical to their U.S. certified counterparts with respect to compliance with Standards Nos. *102 Transmission Shift Lever Sequence* * * * *, 103 *Defrosting and Defogging Systems,* 104 *Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems,* 105 *Hydraulic Brake Systems,* 106 *Brake Hoses,* 109 *New Pneumatic Tires,* 113 *Hood Latch Systems,* 116 *Brake Fluid,* 124 *Accelerator Control Systems,* 201 *Occupant Protection in Interior Impact,* 202 *Head Restraints,* 203 *Impact Resistance for the Driver from the Steering Control System,* 204 *Steering Control Rearward Displacement,* 205 *Glazing Materials,* 206 *Door Locks and Door Retention Components,* 207 *Seating Systems,* 209 *Seat Belt Assemblies,* 210 *Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages, 212 Windshield Retention,* 216 *Roof Crush Resistance,* 219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion,* and 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials.*

Petitioner also contends that non-U.S. certified 1988–1989 Audi 80 passenger cars are capable of being readily altered to meet the following standards, in the manner indicated:

Standard No. 101 *Controls and Displays:* (a) Substitution of a lens marked ''Brake'' for a lens with a noncomplying symbol on the brake failure indicator lamp; (b) installation of a seat belt warning lamp that displays the appropriate symbol; (c) recalibration of the speedometer/odometer from kilometers to miles per hour.

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment:* (a) Installation of U.S.-model headlamp assemblies; (b) installation of U.S.-model sidemarker/reflector assemblies; (c) installation of U.S.-model taillamp assemblies; (d) installation of a high mounted stop lamp.

Standard No. 110 *Tire Selection and Rims:* Installation of a tire information placard.

Standard No. 111 *Rearview Mirror:* Replacement of the convex passenger side rearview mirror.

Standard No. 114 *Theft Protection:* Installation of a warning buzzer microswitch and a warning buzzer in the steering lock assembly.

Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection:* (a) Installation of either a U.S.—model seat belt in the driver's position, or a belt webbing actuated microswitch inside the driver's seat belt retractor; (b) installation of an ignition switch actuated seat belt warning lamp and buzzer. The petitioner states that the vehicles are equipped with a combination lap and shoulder restraint that adjusts by means of an automatic retractor and releases by means of a single push button at each front designated seating position, with a combination lap and shoulder restraint that releases by means of a single push button at each rear outboard designated seating position, and with a lap belt in the rear center designated seating position.

Standard No. 214 *Side Impact Protection:* Installation of reinforcing beams.

Standard No. 301 *Fuel System Integrity:* Installation of a rollover valve in the fuel tank vent line between the fuel tank and the evaporative emissions collection canister.

The petitioner also states that a vehicle identification number plate must be affixed to non- U.S. certified 1988–1989 Audi 80 passenger cars to meet the requirements of 49 CFR Part 565.

Additionally, the petitioner states that the bumpers on non-U.S. certified 1988–1989 Audi 80 passenger cars must be reinforced to comply with the Bumper Standard found in 49 CFR part 581.

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on the petition described above. Comments should refer to the docket number and be submitted to: Docket Section, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Room 5109, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. It is requested but not required that 10 copies be submitted.

All comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated above will be considered, and will be available for examination in the docket at the above address both before and after that date. To the extent possible, comments filed after the closing date will also be considered. Notice of final action on the petition will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

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: July 30, 1997.

Marilynne Jacobs,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 97–20521 Filed 8–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 97–048; Notice 1]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1990–1994, 1996 and 1997 Saab 900 SE Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1990–1994, 1996 and 1997 Saab 900 SE 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 1990–1994, 1996, and 1997 Saab 900 SE passenger cars that were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are eligible for importation into the United States because (1) They are substantially similar to vehicles that were originally manufactured for importation into, and sale in, the United States and that were certified by their manufacturer as complying with the safety standards, and (2) they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the petition is September 4, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to the docket number and notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Section, Room 5109, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590. (Docket hours are from 9:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.)

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