

congestion. To date, there has been no investment in fixed guideway systems or in new highways to facilitate commuting and links between the development centers along radial transportation routes that cross the corridor. The current east-west connections include bus transit and to a lesser degree, roadways. Commuters must use a north and south means to travel east-west. The area has limited infrastructure for east-west travel, with two primary routes consisting of East-West Highway (MD 410) and University Boulevard (MD 193), neither of which provides a direct connection between Silver Spring and New Carrollton. These routes are heavily congested during peak periods and increasingly unable to accommodate the traffic demands. The focus of the EIS will be to identify a preferred transit alternative that will reduce travel time, provide an alternative to traveling on congested roadways, and improve transit access to central business districts within the area while examining the socioeconomic, cultural and natural environmental considerations on a local and regional basis.

### III. Alternatives

The alternatives proposed for evaluation include:

- A no-build alternative, which includes the current network plus all ongoing, programmed, and committed projects listed in the latest Transportation Improvement Program;
- A TSM alternative, which would include improving existing transit services such as additional bus service and routes, and which also serves as a baseline for evaluation against which all other alternatives may be compared for federal funding purposes (referred to as the FTA Future Baseline);
- Bus Rapid Transit alternatives; and
- Light rail alternatives.

Each build alternative will explore the construction of new transportation infrastructure, such as tracks, stations, and maintenance yards. Underground, surface and/or aerial design options may be developed for each of the build alternative alignments. Multi-modal alternatives will also be explored.

### IV. Probable Effects

The FTA and MTA will evaluate all potential changes to the social, cultural, economic, built and natural environment, including land acquisition and displacements; land use, zoning, economic development; parklands; community disruption; aesthetics; historical and archaeological resources; traffic and parking; air quality; noise and vibration; water quality; wetlands;

environmentally sensitive areas; endangered species; energy requirements and potential for conservation; hazardous waste; environmental justice; safety and security; and secondary and cumulative impacts. Key areas of environmental concern include areas of potential new construction (e.g., structures, new transit stations, new track, etc.). Impacts will be evaluated for both the short-term construction period and for the long-term period of operation associated with each alternative. Measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate any significant adverse impacts will be identified.

### V. Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Procedures

Previously, a Notice of Intent (NOI) was published in the **Federal Register** on September 21, 1994, which announced the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for the Georgetown Branch Transitway/Trail in Montgomery County, Maryland. The subsequent Draft Environment Impact Statement (DEIS) was completed in May 1996, and evaluated transportation improvements between the central business districts (CBDs) in Bethesda and Silver Spring, Maryland. The DEIS evaluated both a busway and light rail transit alternative in conjunction with a parallel hiker/biker trail. A Final Environmental Impact Statement was never produced for this study.

This NOI for the Bi-County Transitway Project extends the previous projects limits beyond Silver Spring to New Carrollton. An EIS will be prepared in accordance with section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (as amended), as implemented by the Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regulations (23 CFR part 771), and the FTA Statewide Planning/Metropolitan Planning regulations (23 CFR part 450). These studies will comply with the requirements of the National Historical Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, section 4(f) of the 1966 U.S. Department of Transportation Act, the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments, Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice, and other applicable rules, regulations, and guidance documents.

In addition, MTA intends to seek Section 5309 New Starts funding for the project. As provided in the FTA New Starts regulation (49 CFR part 611), New Starts funding requires the submission of certain specific information to FTA to support a request to initiate preliminary engineering, which is normally done in conjunction with the NEPA process.

Upon completion, the Draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment. Public hearings will be held. Based on the findings of the Draft EIS and the public and agency comments received, a preferred alternative will be selected that will be further detailed in the Final EIS.

Issued on: August 27, 2003.

**Herman C. Shipman,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region III,  
Federal Transit Administration.*

[FR Doc. 03–22371 Filed 9–2–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–57–P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2003–16031]

### Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 2001 and 2002 Mitsubishi Evolution VII, Left Hand Drive Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 2001 and 2002 Mitsubishi Evolution VII, left hand drive (LHD) 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 2001 and 2002 Mitsubishi Evolution VII LHD 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 capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards, and (2) 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.

**DATES:** The closing date for comments on the petition is October 3, 2003.

**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 a.m. to 5 p.m. Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association,

business, labor union, *etc.*). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477–78), or you may visit <http://dms.dot.gov>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Coleman Sachs, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202–366–3151).

**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.

Under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(B), a motor vehicle that was not originally manufactured to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards may also be granted admission into the United States, even if there is no substantially similar motor vehicle of the same model year originally manufactured for importation into and sale in United States, if the safety features of the vehicle comply with or are capable of being altered to comply with those standards based on destructive test information or other evidence that NHTSA decides is adequate.

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**.

G&K Automotive Conversion, Inc. of Santa Ana, California ("G&K") (Registered Importer 90–007) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 2001 and 2002 Mitsubishi Evolution VII LHD passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. G&K believes that these vehicles are capable

of being modified to meet all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards (FMVSS).

In its petition, G&K stated that nonconforming 2001 and 2002 Mitsubishi Evolution VII LHD passenger cars are substantially similar to both the U.S. version 2003 Mitsubishi Evolution VIII and the U.S. version 2001 and 2002 Mitsubishi Lancer 4 door sedan passenger cars. Because it is of a different model year, the 2003 Mitsubishi Evolution VIII cannot be regarded as substantially similar to the 2001 and 2002 Mitsubishi Evolution VII for import eligibility purposes. Moreover, while there may be similarities between the 2003 Mitsubishi Evolution VIII and the 2001 and 2002 Mitsubishi Lancer 4 door sedan vehicles that Mitsubishi has manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States NHTSA has decided that the latter vehicle cannot be categorized as "substantially similar" to the nonconforming 2001 and 2002 Mitsubishi Evolution VII LHD versions for the purpose of establishing import eligibility under section 30141(a)(1)(A). Therefore, we will construe G&K's petition as a petition pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(B), seeking to establish import eligibility for the 2001–2002 Mitsubishi Evolution VII on the basis that it has safety features that comply with, or are capable of being modified to comply with, the FMVSS based on destructive test information or such other evidence that NHTSA decided is adequate.

G&K submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 2001 and 2002 Mitsubishi Evolution VII LHD passenger cars, as originally manufactured, conform to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards and are capable of being readily altered to conform to all other standards to which they were not originally manufactured to conform.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that non-U.S. certified 2001 and 2002 Mitsubishi Evolution VII LHD passenger cars have safety features that comply with Standard Nos. 102 *Transmission Shift Lever Sequence* \* \* \*, 103 *Defrosting and Defogging Systems*, 104 *Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems*, 106 *Brake Hoses*, 109 *New Pneumatic Tires*, 113 *Hood Latch Systems*, Standard No. 114 *Theft Protection*, 116 *Brake Fluid*, 118 *Power Window Systems*, 124 *Accelerator Control Systems*, 135 *Passenger Car Brake Systems*, 201 *Occupant Protection in Interior Impact*, 202 *Head Restraints*, 203 *Impact Protection for Driver from Steering Control Systems*, 204 *Steering Control*

*Rearward Displacement*, 205 *Glazing Materials*, 206 *Door Locks and Door Retention Components*, 207 *Seating Systems*, 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*, 209 *Seat Belt Assemblies*, 210 *Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages*, 212 *Windshield Retention*, 214 *Side Impact Protection*, 216 *Roof Crush Resistance*, 219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion*, and 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials*.

Petitioner also contends that the vehicles are capable of being readily altered to meet the following standards, in the manner indicated:

Standard No. 101 *Controls and Displays*: (a) Substitution of the word "Brake" for the international ECE warning symbol as the marking for the brake failure indicator lamp; (b) inspection of all vehicles and installation, on vehicles that are not already so equipped, of a U.S. model speedometer reading in miles per hour.

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment*: installation of U.S.-model front and rear side marker lights and reflector assemblies.

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

Standard No. 111 *Rearview Mirror*: inscription of the required warning statement on the face of the passenger side rearview mirror.

Standard No. 225 *Child Restraint Anchorage Systems*: installation of U.S.-model child restraint anchorage systems.

Standard No. 301 *Fuel System Integrity*: The petitioner stated that modification of fuel system is necessary to meet EPA emission requirements and that after these modifications the vehicle will still comply with this standard.

Standard No. 401 *Interior Trunk Release*: installation of U.S. model interior trunk release handle.

Petitioner states that the front and rear bumper on non-U.S. certified 2001 and 2002 Mitsubishi Evolution VII LHD passenger cars must be reinforced to meet the requirements of the Bumper Standard found in 49 CFR part 581.

The petitioner also states that inspection of all vehicles for compliance with the parts marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard in 49 CFR part 541 is necessary, and that required markings will be added to any covered parts that are not already so marked.

In addition, the petitioner states that a vehicle identification number (VIN) plate must be affixed to the vehicle so that it is readable from outside the

driver's windshield pillar to meet the requirements of 49 CFR part 565.

Lastly, the petitioner states that a certification label will be affixed to the driver's side doorjamb to meet the requirements of the vehicle certification regulations in 49 CFR part 567.

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 a.m. to 5 p.m. 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)(B) and (b)(1); 49 CFR 593.8; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on: August 27, 2003.

**Kenneth N. Weinstein,**

*Associate Administrator for Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. 03-22372 Filed 9-2-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Internal Revenue Service

#### Alteration of Privacy Act Systems of Records Notice

**AGENCY:** Internal Revenue Service, Treasury.

**ACTION:** The Department of the Treasury, Internal Revenue Service, gives notice of proposed alterations to 11 systems of records.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a, as amended, the Department of the Treasury, Internal Revenue Service, proposes to add a routine use to 11 of its systems of records, add another routine use to three of the same systems of records, and to make minor alterations to all 11 systems.

**DATES:** Comments must be received no later than October 3, 2003. The alteration to the systems of records will be effective October 14, 2003 unless the IRS receives comments, which would result in a contrary determination.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be sent to the Office of Governmental Liaison & Disclosure, Internal Revenue Service, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20224. Comments will be made available for public inspection and copying in the Internal Revenue Service Freedom of Information Reading Room, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW., Room 1621, Washington, DC, telephone number 202-622-5164 (not a toll-free call).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Earl Prater, Office of Professional Responsibility, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20224, 202-694-1853 (not a toll-free call).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The 11 systems of records listed below are subject to the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a, as amended:

- Treasury/IRS 37.001—Abandoned Enrollment Applications
- Treasury/IRS 37.002—Files Containing Derogatory Information about Individuals Whose Applications for Enrollment to Practice Before the IRS Have Been Denied and Applicant Appeal Files
- Treasury/IRS 37.003—Closed Files Containing Derogatory Information about Individuals' Practice before the Internal Revenue Service and Files of Attorneys and Certified Public Accountants Formerly Enrolled to Practice
- Treasury/IRS 37.004—Derogatory Information (No Action)
- Treasury/IRS 37.005—Present Suspensions and Disbarments Resulting from Administrative Proceeding
- Treasury/IRS 37.006—General Correspondence File
- Treasury/IRS 37.007—Inventory
- Treasury/IRS 37.008—Register of Docketed Cases and Applicant Appeals
- Treasury/IRS 37.009—Enrolled Agents and Resigned Enrolled Agents (Action pursuant to 31 CFR 10.55(b))
- Treasury/IRS 37.010—Roster of Former Enrollees
- Treasury/IRS 37.011—Present Suspensions from Practice before the Internal Revenue Service.

In accordance with the Act's requirements, the Department of the Treasury, Internal Revenue Service, proposes:

- To add a routine use to disclose to contractors to each of these 11 systems;
- To add a second routine use to Treasury/IRS 37.005, 37.009, and 37.011, which conforms with 31 CFR part 10, section 10.90, to disclose information regarding persons enrolled

to practice, the roster of all persons censured, suspended, or disbarred from practice before the Internal Revenue Service, and the roster of disqualified appraisers; and

- To make minor alterations to all 11 systems.

The systems were established to give notice of records collected by the Office of Professional Responsibility ("OPR"), formerly Office of Director of Practice, to accomplish its mission under the regulations governing practice before the IRS, 31 CFR part 10 (published in pamphlet form as Treasury Department Circular No. 230): Enrolling individuals to practice and instituting disciplinary proceedings against IRS practitioners who violate those regulations. The systems were last published in their entirety in the **Federal Register**: December 10, 2001 (Volume 66, Number 237), pages 63826 through 63835.

Major alterations: The IRS has determined that certain work associated with the enrollment function should be contracted out. This work includes: Writing and administering the Special Enrollment Examination ("SEE"); processing applications to take the SEE; grading the SEE; informing examinees of SEE results; processing applications for enrollment and for renewal of enrollment; and operating and maintaining the computerized enrolled agent database. Functions that are inherently governmental will not be contracted out. IRS proposes to add a routine use to allow disclosure to contractors to the extent necessary for the contractors to perform their contractual duties.

A second new routine use is being added to Treasury/IRS 37.005, 37.009, and 37.011 to disclose information regarding persons enrolled to practice, the roster of all persons censured, suspended, or disbarred from practice before the Internal Revenue Service, and the roster of disqualified appraisers. Under 31 CFR part 10, section 10.90, the OPR will make available for public inspection the roster of all persons enrolled to practice, the roster of all persons censured, suspended, or disbarred from practice before the Internal Revenue Service, and the roster of all disqualified appraisers. The new routine use for Treasury/IRS 37.005, 37.009, and 37.011 is consistent with 31 CFR part 10.

Minor alterations: On January 8, 2003, the IRS announced the creation of the OPR as part of its ongoing modernization effort. The new office replaced the Office of Director of Practice. The IRS proposes to update organizational names and addresses and