leaders; public meetings and hearings; distribution of study newsletter(s); and use of other outreach mechanisms. Every effort will be made to ensure that the widest possible range of public participants has the opportunity to attend general public meetings (*e.g.,* scoping meetings and public hearing(s)) held by NJ TRANSIT to solicit input on the West Shore Corridor MIS/DEIS. Attendance will be sought through mailings, notices, advertisements, and press releases.

II. Description of Study Area and Transportation Needs

The study area includes the West Shore corridor, through East Rutherford, Carlstadt, Ridgefield, Ridgefield Park, Bogota, Teaneck, Bergenfield, Dumont, Haworth, Closter, Harrington Park, Norwood, and Northvale in New Jersey and Orangetown and Clarkstown in New York. The purpose of the West Shore corridor MIS/DEIS is to examine solutions for addressing mobility issues in Bergen County, New Jersey and Rockland County, New York, and to identify a preferred alternative that will improve mobility within that region. The MIS/DEIS will be conducted in coordination with other major network expansion proposals under study or construction within the region. The MIS/DEIS will examine and document the social, economic, and environmental impacts of implementing identified study alternatives.

Provision of new transportation service in the West Shore corridor would address:

- Commuting to New York City (trans-Hudson), from Bergen and Rockland Counties;
- Inter- and intra-corridor commuting, both to employment centers within the study corridors, and from the study corridors to employment locations in other areas of New Jersey; and,
- Non-work trips including business, shopping, recreational, and education to New York City, within the corridor, and to destinations outside the corridor in New Jersey.

III. Alternatives

The alternatives proposed for evaluation include: (1) the Baseline Alternative, which includes no-build conditions, plus any cost-effective transit improvements that can be implemented, short of the proposed new start alternative. The no-build conditions involve the current infrastructure of highways, trains, and bus services, in addition to all ongoing, committed and funded roadway and transit projects outlined in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) including projects under construction such as the Secaucus Transfer Station and the Hudson-Bergen Light Rail Transit (HBLRT). Transit improvements lower in cost than the proposed new start alternative were also identified for inclusion in the Baseline Alternative, including a bus component from Bergen and Rockland Counties to the East Midtown Manhattan; enhanced rail service including new hourly off-peak service on the Pascack Valley Line; and additional ferry service from Congers in Rockland County to Midtown Manhattan. (2) the Build Alternative, West Shore commuter rail service via the Meadowlands Sports Complex. The Build Alternative will involve construction of new transportation infrastructure, including tracks, stations and yards. Additional reasonable Build alternatives suggested during the scoping process, including those involving other modes, may be considered.

IV. Probable Effects

The FTA and NJ TRANSIT will evaluate all potential changes to the social, economic, and physical environment, including air quality, noise and vibration, traffic, parking, transit, pedestrians and freight rail, energy and potential for conservation, electric and magnetic fields, safety and security, water quality, wetlands, flooding, navigable waterways and coastal zones, ecologically sensitive areas, endangered species, hazardous waste, land acquisition and displacements, land use, zoning and economic development, consistency with local plans, historic properties and resources, parkland, archaeology, aesthetics, community disruption, environmental justice, construction impacts, and cumulative impacts. Key areas of environmental concern would be in the areas of potential new construction (e.g. new stations, new track, etc.). The impacts will be evaluated both for the construction period and for the long-term period of operation of each alternative. Measures to mitigate any significant adverse impacts will be identified.

V. FTA Procedures

The DEIS will be prepared in conjunction with a major investment study and will document the results of that study, including an evaluation of the potential social, economic, and environmental impacts of the alternatives. Upon completion, the MIS/DEIS will be available for public and agency review and comment. Public hearing(s) will be held within the study area. On the basis of the MIS/DEIS and the public and agency comments received, a locally preferred alternative will be selected, to be further detailed in the final EIS.

Issued on: June 13, 2001.

Letitia Thompson,

Regional Administrator, TRO–II, Federal Transit Administration.

[FR Doc. 01–15330 Filed 6–15–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–57–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2001–9882]

Decision That Certain Nonconforming Motor Vehicles Are Eligible for Importation

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

ACTION: Notice of decision by NHTSA that certain nonconforming motor vehicles are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This document announces decisions by NHTSA that certain motor vehicles 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/or sale in the United States and certified by their manufacturers as complying with the safety standards, and they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: These decisions are effective as of the date of their publication in the **Federal Register**.

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**.

NHTSA received petitions from registered importers to decide whether the vehicles listed in Annex A to this notice are eligible for importation into the United States. To afford an opportunity for public comment, NHTSA published notice of these petitions as specified in Annex A. The reader is referred to those notices for a thorough description of the petitions. No comments were received in response to these notices. Based on its review of the information submitted by the petitioners, NHTSA has decided to grant the petitions.

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. Vehicle eligibility numbers assigned to vehicles admissible under this decision are specified in Annex A.

Final Decision

Accordingly, on the basis of the foregoing, NHTSA hereby decides that each motor vehicle listed in Annex A to this notice, which was not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards, is substantially similar to a motor vehicle manufactured for importation into and/or sale in the United States, and certified under 49 U.S.C. 30115, as specified in Annex A, and is 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: June 13, 2001.

Marilynne Jacobs,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

ANNEX A—Nonconforming Motor Vehicles Decided To Be Eligible for Importation

1. Docket No. NHTSA–2000–7964
   Nonconforming Vehicle: 2000 BMW 3 Series passenger cars
   Substantially similar U.S.- certified vehicle: 2000 BMW 3 Series passenger cars
   Notice of Petition Published at: 65 FR 63911 (October 25, 2000)
   Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–356
2. Docket No. NHTSA–2000–7963
   Nonconforming Vehicles: 1998 Mercedes-Benz CLK320 passenger cars
   Substantially similar U.S.- certified vehicles: 1998 Mercedes-Benz CLK320 passenger cars
   Notice of Petition Published at: 65 FR 63910 (October 25, 2000)
   Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–357
3. Docket No. NHTSA–2000–7966
   Nonconforming Vehicles: 1996 Plymouth Voyager multi-purpose passenger vehicles
   Substantially similar U.S.- certified vehicles: 1996 Plymouth Voyager multi-purpose passenger vehicles
   Notice of Petition Published at: 65 FR 63909 (October 25, 2000)
   Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–353
4. Docket No. NHTSA–2000–8242
   Nonconforming Vehicles: 1994–2000 Honda VFR 400 and RVF 400 motorcycles
   Substantially similar U.S.- certified vehicles: 1994–2000 Honda CBR 600 motorcycles
   Notice of Petition Published at: 65 FR 77690 (December 12, 2000)
   Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–358
5. Docket No. NHTSA–2000–8241
   Nonconforming Vehicles: 1991–1995 BMW 8 Series passenger cars
   Substantially similar U.S.- certified vehicles: 1991–1995 BMW 8 Series passenger cars
   Notice of Petition Published at: 65 FR 69989 (November 21, 2000)
   Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–361
6. Docket No. NHTSA–2000–8294
   Nonconforming Vehicle: 1998–2001 BMW R1200C motorcycles
   Substantially similar U.S.- certified vehicle: 1998–2001 BMW R1200C motorcycles
   Notice of Petition Published at: 65 FR 77691 (December 12, 2000)
   Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–359
7. Docket No. NHTSA–2000–8281
   Nonconforming Vehicles: 2000 Yamaha R1 motorcycles
   Substantially similar U.S.- certified vehicles: 2000 Yamaha R1 motorcycles
   Notice of Petition Published at: 65 FR 77692 (December 12, 2000)
   Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–360
8. Docket No. NHTSA–2000–8699
   Nonconforming Vehicles: 2001 Harley Davidson FX, FL and XL motorcycles
   Substantially similar U.S.- certified vehicles: 2001 Harley Davidson FX, FL and XL motorcycles
   Notice of Petition Published at: 66 FR 7841 (January 25, 2001)
   Vehicle Eligibility Number: VSP–362

[FR Doc. 01–15327 Filed 6–15–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2000–7312; Notice 2]

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

General Motors Corporation (GM) has determined that some of its vehicles do not comply with requirements contained in Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 108, ''Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment,'' and has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, ''Defect and Noncompliance Reports.'' GM has 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 in the **Federal Register** (65 FR 31207) on May 16, 2000. Opportunity was afforded for public comment until June 15, 2000.

FMVSS No. 108 establishes the requirements for signaling to enable safe operation in darkness and other conditions of reduced visibility. Under S5.5.4 of FMVSS No. 108, the center high-mounted stop lamp (CHMSL) on each vehicle shall be activated only upon application of the service brakes.

During Model Year 1995–1999, GM produced 3,375,393 vehicles with a CHMSL that could briefly illuminate if the hazard warning lamp switch is depressed to its limit of travel. The vehicles that may have this condition are 1995–1999 model year GMC and Chevrolet trucks and some 1997–1999 Pontiac Grand Prix cars.

GM supports its application for inconsequential noncompliance with the following statements: