

corporate average fuel economy program. The agency notes that vehicles which are manufactured for police or other law enforcement purposes can ordinarily be identified by special features such as sirens, decals, a metal cage partition, removed interior rear-door release handles, or special handling features. The agency requests comments concerning whether all law enforcement vehicles include at least some of these (or other) special features, and on whether a more detailed definition, identifying vehicle attributes, can be developed that would be appropriate for all law enforcement vehicles.

NHTSA is proposing to make the proposed amendments effective 30 days after publication of a final rule. NHTSA believes that there would be good cause for such an effective date since the amendments would not impose any new requirements but instead relieve a restriction.

### Rulemaking Analyses and Notices

#### A. Executive Order 12866 and DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures

NHTSA has considered the impact of this rulemaking action under E.O. 12866 and the Department of Transportation's regulatory policies and procedures. This rulemaking document was not reviewed under E.O. 12866, "Regulatory Planning and Review." This action has been determined to be "non-significant" under the Department of Transportation's regulatory policies and procedures. The proposed amendments would not impose any new requirements but simply remove a restriction. Therefore, the impacts of the proposed amendments would be so minor that a full regulatory evaluation is not required. There would be slight cost savings, on the order of \$5.00 or less per belt system, associated with not being required to provide an emergency locking retractor. For the Laguna system, these cost savings would be offset by the costs associated with some of the special features of its belt system, i.e., the extra buckle and the magnets. NHTSA notes, however, that these special features would not be required by the standard.

#### B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

NHTSA has also considered the impacts of this notice under the Regulatory Flexibility Act. I hereby certify that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. As explained above, the rule would not impose any new requirements but would instead relieve a restriction for

law enforcement vehicles. Any economic impact would be in the nature of slight cost savings for small government organizations which purchase law enforcement vehicles. For these reasons, small businesses, small organizations and small governmental units which purchase motor vehicles would not be significantly affected by the proposed requirements.

#### C. Paperwork Reduction Act

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (Pub. L. 96-511), there are no requirements for information collection associated with this proposed rule.

#### D. National Environmental Policy Act

NHTSA has also analyzed this proposed rule under the National Environmental Policy Act and determined that it would not have a significant impact on the human environment.

#### E. Executive Order 12612 (Federalism)

NHTSA has analyzed this proposal in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in E.O. 12612, and has determined that this proposed rule would not have significant federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

#### F. Civil Justice Reform

This proposed rule would not have any retroactive effect. Under 49 U.S.C. 30103, whenever a Federal motor vehicle safety standard is in effect, a State may not adopt or maintain a safety standard applicable to the same aspect of performance which is not identical to the Federal standard, except to the extent that the state requirement imposes a higher level of performance and applies only to vehicles procured for the State's use. 49 U.S.C. 30161 sets forth a procedure for judicial review of final rules establishing, amending or revoking Federal motor vehicle safety standards. That section does not require submission of a petition for reconsideration or other administrative proceedings before parties may file suit in court.

#### Submission of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on the proposal. It is requested but not required that 10 copies be submitted.

All comments must not exceed 15 pages in length. (49 CFR 553.21). Necessary attachments may be appended to these submissions without regard to the 15-page limit. This limitation is intended to encourage

commenters to detail their primary arguments in a concise fashion.

If a commenter wishes to submit certain information under a claim of confidentiality, three copies of the complete submission, including purportedly confidential business information, should be submitted to the Chief Counsel, NHTSA, at the street address given above, and seven copies from which the purportedly confidential information has been deleted should be submitted to the Docket Section. A request for confidentiality should be accompanied by a cover letter setting forth the information specified in the agency's confidential business information regulation. 49 CFR part 512.

All comments received before the close of business on the comment closing date indicated above for the proposal 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. Comments received too late for consideration in regard to the final rule will be considered as suggestions for further rulemaking action. Comments on the proposal will be available for inspection in the docket. The NHTSA will continue to file relevant information as it becomes available in the docket after the closing date, and it is recommended that interested persons continue to examine the docket for new material.

Those persons desiring to be notified upon receipt of their comments in the rules docket should enclose a self-addressed, stamped postcard in the envelope with their comments. Upon receiving the comments, the docket supervisor will return the postcard by mail.

#### List of Subjects in 49 CFR Part 571

Imports, Motor vehicle safety, Motor vehicles.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is proposed that 49 CFR part 571 be amended as follows:

#### PART 571—FEDERAL MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY STANDARDS

1. The authority citation for part 571 of title 49 would continue to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 322, 30111, 30115, 30117, and 30166; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.

2. Section 571.208 would be amended by revising sections S7, S7.1.1.2, S7.1.1.3 and S7.2 to read as follows: