Federal holidays.) Persons desiring notification that their comments have been received should submit a stamped, self-addressed postcard with their comments. The postcard will be returned to the addressee with a notation of the date on which the comments were received.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gregory B. McBride, Deputy Chief Counsel, FTA, TCC–2, Room 9316, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590 (telephone: (202) 366–4063); and Daniel C. Smith, Assistant Chief Counsel for Safety, FRA, RCC–10, 1120 Vermont Avenue, NW, Mail Stop 10, Washington, DC 20590 (telephone: (202) 493–6029).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the proposed joint policy statement issued on May 25, 1999 by FRA and FTA, the agencies explained that the proposal is intended to delineate the nature of the most important safety issues related to shared use of the general railroad system by conventional and rail transit equipment and summarize the application of FRA safety rules to such shared-use operations. The proposal will help transit authorities, railroads, and other interested parties understand how the respective safety programs of the two agencies will be coordinated. The proposed statement noted that FRA soon intended to issue its own proposed statement of agency policy concerning its safety jurisdiction over railroad operations, which would discuss the extent and exercise of FRA's jurisdiction, provide guidance on which of FRA's safety rules are likely to apply in particular operational situations, and summarize how the process of obtaining waivers of FRA's safety regulations may work. The expectation of the two agencies was that commenters would then have the ability to study and analyze FRA's proposed policy statement before October 29, 1999, the revised deadline for submitting written comments on the proposed joint statement.

Since FRA has not yet issued its separate proposed policy statement, potential commenters will be unable to review that document before the close of the revised comment deadline for the proposed joint statement. Due to the complexity and importance of adopting a joint policy concerning shared use of the general railroad system by conventional railroads and light rail transit systems, especially to communities that are planning or developing light rail systems, FRA and FTA do not wish to inhibit the ability of any party to fully develop its comments and seek to provide sufficient time for all interested parties to gather necessary information. Consequently, FRA and FTA believe it is in the best interest of all parties involved to extend the period for the submission of written comments in this proceeding to January 14, 2000, which is the anticipated deadline that FRA will set for submission of comments on its separate proposed statement of agency policy. FRA and FTA do not anticipate any further extension of the comment period in this proceeding. The two agencies will consider comments submitted after January 14, 2000, only to the extent possible without causing additional expense or delay.

Issued in Washington, DC, on October 25, 1999.

Jolene M. Molitoris,

Federal Railroad Administrator.

[FR Doc. 99–28350 Filed 10–28–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–99–6383]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1998 Jaguar XK–8 Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1998 Jaguar XK–8 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 a 1998 Jaguar XK–8 passenger car 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 November 29, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to the docket number and notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590. [Docket hours are from 9 am to 5 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), 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**.

Champagne Imports of Lansdale, Pennsylvania (''Champagne'') (Registered Importer 90–009) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether a 1998 Jaguar XK–8 passenger car is eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicle which Champagne believes is substantially similar is the 1998 Jaguar XK–8 passenger car 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 1998 Jaguar XK–8 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.

Champagne submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that the non-U.S. certified 1998 Jaguar XK–8, 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 1998 Jaguar XK–8 is identical to its U.S. certified counterpart with respect to compliance with Standard 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,* 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.*

Additionally, the petitioner states that the vehicle conforms to the Bumper Standard found at 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 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 to show distance in miles and speed in 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 front and rear sidemarker/reflector assemblies; (c) Installation of U.S.-model taillamp assemblies; (d) Installation of a high mounted stop lamp if the vehicle is not already so equipped.

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

Standard No. 111 *Rearview Mirror:* Replacement of the passenger side rearview mirror with a U.S.-model component.

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

Standard No. 118 *Power Window Systems:* Rewiring of the power window system so that the window transport is inoperative when the ignition is switched off.

Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection:* (a) Installation of 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; (c) Replacement of the driver's and passenger's side air bags and knee bolsters with U.S.-model components on vehicles that are not already so equipped. The petitioner states that the vehicle is equipped with combination lap and shoulder belts that adjust by means of an automatic retractor and release by means of a single push button at the front outboard seating positions, with combination lap and shoulder restraints that release by means of a single push button at the rear outboard seating positions, and with a lap belt in the rear center designated seating position.

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

Standard No. 301 *Fuel System Integrity:* Installation of a rollover valve in the fuel tank vent line.

The petitioner also states that all vehicles will be inspected prior to importation to ensure that they are equipped with anti-theft devices in compliance with the Theft Prevention Standard found in 49 CFR part 541 and modified if necessary.

The petitioner also states that a vehicle identification plate must be affixed to the vehicle to meet the requirements of 49 CFR part 565.

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on the petition described above. Comments should refer to the docket number and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh St., SW, Washington, DC 20590. [Docket hours are from 9 am to 5 pm]. 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 October 22, 1999.

Marilynne Jacobs,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 99–28099 Filed 10–27–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–99–6384]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1994 Eagle Vision Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1994 Eagle Vision 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 1994 Eagle Vision 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 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 November 29, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to the docket number and notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh St., SW, Washington, DC 20590. [Docket hours are from 9 am to 5 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), 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