comments should focus on identifying specific social, economic, or environmental impacts to be evaluated, and suggesting alternatives that are less costly or less environmentally damaging which achieve similar objectives. Comments should focus on the issues and alternatives for analysis, and not on a preference for a particular alternative. Individual preference for a particular alternative should be communicated during the comment period for the Draft EIS.

If you wish to be placed on the mailing list to receive further information as the project continues, contact Mr. Andrew Brennan at the MBTA (see **ADDRESSES** above).

# II. Description of Study Area and Project Need

The proposed project consists of an approximately 3 mile rail tunnel linking North and South Stations in Boston, Massachusetts. The northern tunnel portals will be located to the north of the Gilmore Bridge and west of the I-93 highway viaduct in Somerville, Massachusetts. There will be two southern tunnel portals: one on the southern side of the Massachusetts Turnpike between Harrison and Shawmut Avenues, and the other in the vicinity of the railroad yard south of the West Fourth Street Bridge in South Boston. Three underground passenger stations are proposed: (1) At the existing South Station, (2) near the MBTA Blue Line adjacent to the Aquarium Station, and (3) between Haymarket and North Stations. The project will also define options for creating regional MBTA rail service by combining the two currently separate north and south side commuter rail networks.

The construction of the rail link tunnel will close the gap in intercity rail service along the Atlantic seaboard, and will create a unified rail system for metropolitan Boston by combining the two currently separate north and south side commuter rail networks. This will reduce rapid transit system congestion in downtown Boston, increase operational capacity at South Station, and improve regional air quality by diverting automobile trips to the rail system.

### III. Alternatives

The alternatives proposed for evaluation include: (1) No-action, which involves no change to existing rail facilities at North and South Stations,

(2) construction of a rail link tunnel connecting North and South Stations along the Central Artery alignment. A two-track and a four-track tunnel option will be considered, and (3) a transportation system management alternative that will be identified during the scoping process.

Although the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has elected to pursue the North-South Rail Link corridor within the Central Artery alignment, the FTA is interested in receiving comments regarding whether a rail link along the Congress Street alignment should be included in the MIS.

#### **IV. Probable Effects**

FTA and the MBTA will evaluate all significant environmental, social, and economic impacts of the alternatives analyzed in the EIS. Impacts include changes in the natural environment (air and water quality, rare and endangered species), changes in the social environment (land use and neighborhoods, noise and vibration, aesthetics, park lands, historic/ archeological resources), disposal of excavated material, public safety and changes in rail service and patronage. An operational analysis of combined north and south side commuter rail networks will be performed and project capital and operating costs and revenues will be estimated. The impacts will be evaluated both for the construction period and for the long term period of operation, and financial information in support of the MIS will be provided. Measures to mitigate significant adverse impacts will also be addressed.

Issued on: March 2, 1995.

#### **Richard H. Doyle**,

Regional Administrator. [FR Doc. 95–5587 Filed 3–7–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–57–P

#### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 92-50; Notice 4]

## Autokraft Ltd.; Grant of Application for Renewal of Temporary Exemption From Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 208

Autokraft Limited of Weybridge, Surrey, England, applied for a renewal of NHTSA Exemption No. 92–6, exempting its AC MkIV until January 1, 1995, from compliance with paragraph S4.1.4 of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection.* The basis of the application was that compliance would cause substantial economic hardship to a manufacturer that has tried to comply with the standard in good faith.

Notice of receipt of the application was published on December 19, 1994,

and an opportunity afforded for comment (59 FR 65428).

Autokraft was granted NHTSA Exemption No. 92–6 on December 21, 1992 (57 FR 60563), and its exemption from S4.1.4 of Standard No. 208 was scheduled to expire on January 1, 1995. Because the application for renewal of the exemption was filed "not later than 60 days before the termination date" (in this instance, October 27, 1994), the termination date has been stayed until the Administrator has acted upon the application (49 CFR 555.8(e)).

The applicant sought a further twoyear exemption for its AC Mk IV passenger car, of which it has produced 15 in the year preceding the filing of its application. Although the company had projected sales of 150 units in the United States in the years 1992–94, in fact, there were only seven sales. According to its application, Autokraft "has continued the process of researching and developing the installation of a driver and passenger side airbag system" but "we have been unable to achieve the fitting of a suitable system mainly due to the chassis design being based upon a classic 1960's design and not easily adaptable to suit air bag installation." The delay is also due to "the project having insufficient funds generated by sales and available for completing the development.'

Autokraft concluded that the adaptation of an existing automatic restraint system is the only viable alternative. Its continuation of compliance efforts has given it "significant knowledge into the areas of vehicle modification, computer simulation, design rough road testing and low, medium and high speed crash testing." Complicating its efforts is the need to use a different engine and transmission after October 1, 1995, and the possible effect that this will have upon compliance. It estimated the cost to achieve conformance would be \$550,000, achievable by spreading these costs during the exemption period. Autokraft reported losses totalling 3,308,243 Pounds Sterling (approximately \$5,624,000 at a rate of \$1.70/1) for the years 1992-93, and projected a further loss for 1994.

The company argued that an exemption would be in the public interest and consistent with the objectives of motor vehicle safety because it meets all applicable EEC standards, and all U.S. Federal motor vehicle safety standards with the exception of the automatic restraint requirements of Standard No. 208 (its 3point driver and passenger restraints meet the previous requirements). The production of the car makes available to