Issued on: September 7, 1995.

Harry Thompson,

Acting Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 95–22599 Filed 9–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–M

[Docket No. 95–55; Notice 2]

Decision That Nonconforming 1992 Jaguar XJS Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

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

ACTION: Notice of decision by NHTSA that nonconforming 1992 Jaguar XJS passenger care are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the decision by NHTSA that 1992 Jaguar XJS 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 manufacturers complying with the safety standards (the U.S.-certified version of the 1992 Jaguar XJS), and they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: This decision is effective as of September 12, 1995.

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 published this decision in the **Federal Register.**

Wallace Environmental Testing Laboratories, Inc. of Houston, Texas (Registered Importer R–90–005) petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1992 Jaguar XJS passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. NHSTA published notice of the petition on July 21, 1995 (60 FR 37704) 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–129 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 a 1992 Jaguar XJS not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards is substantially similar to a 1992 Jaguar XJS originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States and certified under 49 U.S.C. § 30115, 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 September 7, 1995.

Harry Thompson,

Acting Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 95–22600 Filed 9–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–M

[Docket No. 95–74; Notice 1]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision that Nonconforming 1989 Nissan Maxima Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1989 Nissan Maxima 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 a 1989 Nissan Maxima that was not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards is eligible for importation into the United States because (1) it is substantially similar to a vehicle that was originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States and that was certified by its manufacturer as complying with the safety standards, and (2) it is capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the petition is [30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**].

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 am to 4 pm]

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.**

Liphardt & Associates of Ronkonkoma, New York (''Liphardt'') (Registered Importer 90–004) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1989 Nissan Maxima passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicle which Liphardt believes is substantially similar is the 1989 Nissan Maxima that was manufactured for importation into, and sale in, the United States and certified by its manufacturer as conforming to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared the non-U.S. certified 1989 Nissan Maxima to its U.S. certified counterpart, and found the two vehicles to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Liphardt submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that the non-U.S. certified 1989 Nissan Maxima, as originally manufactured, conforms to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as its U.S. certified counterpart, or is capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that the non-U.S. certified 1989 Nissan Maxima is identical to its U.S. certified counterpart 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,* 107 *Reflecting Surfaces,* 109 *New Pneumatic Tires,* 111 *Rearview Mirrors,* 113 *Hood Latch Systems,* 116 *Brake Fluid,* 118 *Power Window Systems,* 124 *Accelerator Control Systems,* 201 *Occupant Protection in Interior Impact,* 202 *Head Restraints,* 203 *Impact Protection 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,* 211 *Wheel Nuts, Wheel Discs and Hubcaps,* 212 *Windshield Retention,* 216 *Roof Crush Resistance,* 219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion,* 301 *Fuel System Integrity,* and 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials.*

Additionally, the petitioner states that the non-U.S. certified 1989 Nissan Maxima complies with the Bumper Standard found in 49 CFR Part 581.

Petitioner also contends that the vehicle is 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 an ECE symbol on the brake failure indicator lamp; (b) 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 which incorporate sealed beams and sidemarkers; (b) installation of U.S.-model taillamps; (c) installation of a high mounted stop lamp.

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

Standard No. 114 *Theft Protection*: installation of a warning buzzer in the steering lock electrical circuit.

Standard No. 115 *Vehicle Identification Number*: installation of a VIN plate that can be read from outside the left windshield pillar, and a VIN reference label on the edge of the door or latch post nearest the driver.

Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*: installation of a seat belt warning buzzer. The petitioner states that the vehicle is equipped with a seat belt warning lamp and with seat belt assemblies that are identical to those found on its U.S. certified counterpart.

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

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: September 7, 1995.

Harry Thompson,

Acting Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 95–22601 Filed 9–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–M

[Docket No. 93–50; Notice 4]

Denial of Petition for Reconsideration, Nassau Technologies; Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Response of Petition for Reconsideration.

SUMMARY: This notice denies a petition from Nassau Technologies, Inc., for reconsideration of NHTSA's decision not to include motor vehicle glazing as a major vehicle component, which would be subject to the parts-marking requirement of 49 CFR Part 541, Federal Motor Vehicle (Theft Prevention Standard). NHTSA is denying the petition because it believes that it needs cost and effectiveness information beyond that which it received in connection with this petition in order to make an informed decision about whether motor vehicle glazing should be added to the list of major components for which parts-marking is required by the theft prevention standard.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Barbara Gray, Office of Market Incentives, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Ms. Gray's telephone number is (202) 366–1740. Her fax number is (202) 493–2739.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 7, 1993, NHTSA published in the **Federal Register** an advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM) (58 FR 36376), seeking comments on possible definitions of multipurpose passenger vehicle (MPVs) and light-duty truck (LDTs) to be used in the Federal motor vehicle theft prevention standard (49 CFR Part 541) when the agency amended it to add those vehicles categories pursuant to the Anti Car Theft Act of 1992, P.L. 102–519 (October 25, 1992). The ANPRM also sought comments on which MPV and LDT parts should be considered major