

Cove, Suite 3, Memphis, Tennessee 38131-0301; telephone number 901-544-3495. The application may be reviewed in person at this location.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to use the revenue from a PFC at Nashville International Airport under provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Public Law 101-508) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 158).

On January 19, 1996, the FAA determined that the application to use the revenue from a PFC submitted by the Metropolitan Nashville Airport Authority was substantially complete within the requirements of section 158.25 of Part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than April 18, 1996.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

*PFC application number:* 96-02-U-00-BNA

*Level of the PFC:* \$3.00

*Actual charge effective date:* January 1, 1993

*Estimated charge expiration date:* December 1, 2001

*Total estimated PFC revenue:* \$99,443,000

*Total amount of use approval requested in this application:* \$11,713,300

*Brief description of proposed project(s):*  
Construct Concourse Connector—  
Construct International Arrivals Building

*Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs:* Part 135 (air taxi) operators.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Metropolitan Nashville Airport Authority.

Issued in Memphis, Tennessee, on January 19, 1996.

Wayne R. Miles,  
Assistant Manager, Memphis Airports District Office.

[FR Doc. 96-1439 Filed 1-26-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

**Notice of Availability of Scoping Paper for Environmental Impact Statement, Proposed Terminal Doppler Weather Radar To Serve John F. Kennedy International and La Guardia Airports**

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** The FAA announces the availability of a Scoping Paper for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Terminal Doppler Weather Radar (TDWR) to serve John F. Kennedy International and La Guardia Airports. In accordance with requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C), the FAA is conducting a scoping process to determine the issues and alternatives to be analyzed in this EIS. The Scoping Paper outlines objectives and procedures of the scoping process and technical issues to be addressed in the EIS. Copies of the Scoping Paper are available upon request to the FAA.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The FAA announces the availability of a Scoping Paper for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Terminal Doppler Weather Radar (TDWR) to serve John F. Kennedy International and La Guardia Airports. In accordance with requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C), the FAA is conducting a scoping process to determine the issues and alternatives to be analyzed in this EIS.

The Scoping Paper covers the objectives of the scoping process, procedures to be followed by the FAA during the scoping process, planned times and locations of public scoping meetings, the proposed action and alternatives to be addressed in the EIS and anticipated environmental issues. The Scoping Paper also lists the EIS core team members and agencies likely to participate in the EIS process, and includes a draft outline for the EIS. Comments from interested parties on the scope of the EIS and the contents of the Scoping Paper are encouraged and may be submitted to the FAA in writing to the address given below or presented verbally at the scoping meetings. Times and locations of the scoping meetings are given in the Scoping Paper. Written comments must be received by April 2, 1996. Comments should discuss environmental concerns and issues related to the proposed action, suggested analyses and methodologies for inclusion in the EIS, possible sources of relevant data or information,

or feasible alternatives to the proposed action.

Copies of the Scoping Paper are available upon request to the FAA or may be obtained at the scoping meetings. Written requests for copies of the Scoping Paper and written comments on the Scoping Paper should be addressed to FAA as follows: Federal Aviation Administration, Office of the Chief Counsel, Attention: Docket (AGC-200) Docket No. 28365, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jerome D. Schwartz, Environmental Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Wind Shear Products Team, AND-420, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, telephone (202) 358-4946.

Issued in Washington, DC on January 23, 1996.

Loni Czekalski,

Director of Communications, Navigation, and Surveillance Systems, AND-1.

[FR Doc. 96-1536 Filed 1-26-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

**Notice of Public Scoping Meetings for Environmental Impact Statement, Proposed Terminal Doppler Weather Radar To Serve John F. Kennedy International and La Guardia Airports**

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of meetings.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C), the FAA is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Terminal Doppler Weather Radar (TDWR) to serve John F. Kennedy International and La Guardia Airports. The FAA will conduct scoping meetings to obtain public comments on the issues and alternatives to be analyzed in this EIS. Meetings will be held during March 5-7, 1996, at various locations in Brooklyn and Queens, New York, and will be open to all interested parties.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In accordance with requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C), the FAA is conducting a scoping process to determine the issues and alternatives to be analyzed in Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Terminal Doppler Weather Radar (TDWR) to serve John F. Kennedy International and La Guardia Airports. The FAA intends to conduct four public

scoping meetings for this EIS at the times and locations listed under the heading **DATES AND LOCATIONS**. Sign interpretation can be made available at a meeting if requested 10 calendar days before the specific meeting at which the service is required.

Comments from interested parties on the scope of the EIS are encouraged and should be submitted to the FAA in writing or presented verbally at the scoping meetings. Written comments must be received by April 2, 1996. Comments should discuss environmental concerns and issues related to the proposed action, suggested analyses and methodologies for inclusion in the EIS, possible sources of relevant data or information or feasible alternatives to the proposed action. Submit written comments to Federal Aviation Administration, Office of the Chief Counsel, Attention: Docket (AGC-200), Docket No. 28365, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington DC 20591.

**DATES AND LOCATIONS:** March 5, 1996, 7-10 p.m., Travel Lodge, Building #144, JFK International Airport, Jamaica, NY, 11430; March 6, 1996, 9 a.m.-12 noon and 7 p.m.-10 p.m., Kingsborough Community College, 2001 Oriental Avenue, Brooklyn, NY, 11235; March 7, 1996, 7 p.m.-10 p.m., Ramada Inn, 90-10 Grand Central Parkway, East Elmhurst, NY 11369.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jerome D. Schwartz, Environmental Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Wind Shear Products Team, AND-420, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington DC 20591, telephone (202) 358-4946.

Issued in Washington, DC, on January 23, 1996.

Loni Czekalski,

*Director of Communications, Navigation, and Surveillance Systems, AND-1.*

[FR Doc. 96-1535 Filed 1-26-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

## National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 95-57; Notice 2]

### General Motors Corp.; Grant of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

General Motors Corporation (GM) of Warren, Michigan, determined that some of its vehicles failed to comply with the requirements of 49 CFR 571.108, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 108, "Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment," and filed an appropriate

report pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports." GM 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 on July 26, 1995, and an opportunity afforded for comment (60 FR 38392).

Paragraph S5.5.10(d) of FMVSS No. 108 requires that "all other lamps [not mentioned in Paragraphs S5.5.10(a-c) which includes all stop lamps such as center high-mounted stop lamps (CHMSLs)] shall be wired to be steady-burning."

During the 1995 model year, GM manufactured a total of 96,607 GMC and Chevrolet Suburban, GMC Yukon, and Chevrolet Tahoe vehicles with CHMSLs that were inadvertently wired in a manner which permits the CHMSLs to momentarily flash under certain conditions while the driver is in the process of activating or deactivating the hazard flashers. As a result, they do not meet the requirement of Paragraph S5.5.10(d) that they be "wired to be steady-burning." While GM designed the vehicles to meet this requirement, it subsequently discovered a transient contact condition inside the multi-function (stop lamp, CHMSL, turn signal, and hazard flasher) switch which occasionally causes the CHMSL to flash while the driver is in the process of turning the hazard flasher switch "on" or "off." The error was corrected in production in March 1995 by adding a brake lamp relay to the I/P harness to provide isolation from the multi-function switch transient.

GM supported its application for inconsequential noncompliance with the following:

The CHMSL performs properly at all times when the service brakes are applied. The transient condition will not occur if the service brakes are applied when the driver activates or deactivates the hazard flasher switch. Therefore, the CHMSL will not flash when it is required to be steady-burning. The CHMSL will not flash if the ignition switch is in the "off" position. Thus, the condition will not occur if the hazard flashers are turned "off" or "on" when the ignition is off and the vehicle is parked at the side of the road, for example.

If the CHMSL flashes at all, it will illuminate a maximum of three times during the transient condition, with each pulse lasting 0.5 [millisecond (ms)] to 4.0 ms. The entire unintended event, in its worst case, lasts no more than 125.8 ms. This extremely short duration is likely to go entirely unnoticed by following drivers in many instances. In the event that it is noticed, it is

not likely to be confused with anything other than the hazard flashers. Since the flashers will be activated while the unintended condition occurs, but the brake lamps will not be, this will not present a safety risk.

The CHMSL otherwise meets all of the requirements of FMVSS 108.

In a 1989 interpretation, NHTSA discussed the difference between the requirements that stop lamps be steady-burning and hazard warning lights flash. NHTSA explained:

Standard No. 108 requires stop lamps to be steady-burning, and hazard warning signal lamps to flash (generally through the turn signal lamps). The primary reason for the distinction is that the stop lamps are intended to be operated while the vehicle is in motion, while hazard warning lamps are intended to indicate that the vehicle is stopped. Each lamp is intended to convey a single, easily recognizable signal. If a lamp which is ordinarily steady burning begins to flash, the agency is concerned that the signal will prove confusing to motorists, thereby diluting the effectiveness.

August 8, 1989 letter from S.P. Wood, Acting Chief Counsel, NHTSA, to L.P. Egley

While this condition technically causes a lamp which is ordinarily steady burning to begin to flash, it will not likely "prove confusing to motorists, thereby diluting its effectiveness," because it will not occur if the service brakes are applied. Even if the condition were mistaken for a brake signal (which is doubtful since CHMSLs do not flash with brake lamp activation), the following driver would not likely react to it. According to recent research studies conducted by GM, as well as field data, it takes a following driver at least 0.5 seconds to react to a signal and apply the service brakes once [a] preceding vehicle's brake lamps are activated. Given the extremely short duration of the transient CHMSL condition, the misinterpreted signal would be gone long before the following driver could respond.

Hazard flashers are not frequently used. Thus, the exposure of following drivers to the noncompliant condition would be very limited. This is particularly true because of the transient nature of the condition, its short duration, and the fact that it will not occur at all if the service brakes are applied or the vehicle's ignition is off.

GM is not aware of any accidents, injuries, owner complaints, or field reports related to this condition.

No comments were received on the application.

GM states that "[t]he entire unintended event, in its worst case, lasts no more than 125.8 ms." This is 1/8th of a second. As GM further stated, according to its research studies and field data, it takes a following driver at least half a second to react to a signal and to apply the service brakes once a preceding vehicle's brakes are activated. NHTSA finds this a convincing argument that the transient activation of the CHMSL, a false signal, is highly unlikely to mislead a following driver