

available for examination during regular business hours (9 a.m.–5 p.m.) at the above facility. All documents in the public docket are also available for inspection and copying on the Internet at the docket facility's Web site at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

FRA wishes to inform all potential commenters that 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>.

FRA expects to be able to determine these matters without an oral hearing. However, if a specific request for an oral hearing is accompanied by a showing that the party is unable to adequately present his or her position by written statements, an application may be set for public hearing.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 19, 2004.

Grady C. Cothen, Jr.,

Acting Associate Administrator for Safety.

[FR Doc. 04–12132 Filed 5–27–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket No. MARAD–2004–17957]

Information Collection Available for Public Comments and Recommendations

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the Maritime Administration's (MARAD's) intentions to request extension of approval for three years of a currently approved information collection.

DATES: Comments should be submitted on or before July 27, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Kurfehs, Maritime Administration, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: (202) 366–2318; fax: (202) 493–2180; or e-mail: bill.kurfehs@marad.dot.gov. Copies of this collection also can be obtained from that office.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title of Collection: Application and Reporting Requirements for

Participation in the Maritime Security Program.

Type of Request: Extension of currently approved information collection.

OMB Control Number: 2133–0525.

Form Numbers: None.

Expiration Date of Approval: Three years from date of approval by the Office of Management and Budget.

Summary of Collection of Information: The Maritime Security Act of 2003 provides for the enrollment of qualified vessels in the Maritime Security Program Fleet. Applications and amendments are used to select vessels for the fleet. Periodic reporting is used to monitor adherence of contractors to program parameters.

Need and Use of the Information: The collected information is necessary for MARAD to determine if selected vessels are qualified to participate in the Maritime Security Program.

Description of Respondents:

Respondents are vessel operators.

Annual Responses: 198.5.

Annual Burden: 224 hours.

Comments: Comments should refer to the docket number that appears at the top of this document. Written comments may be submitted to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Comments also may be submitted by electronic means via the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov/submit>. Specifically address whether this information collection is necessary for proper performance of the functions of the agency and will have practical utility, accuracy of the burden estimates, ways to minimize this burden, and ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected. All comments received will be available for examination at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m. e.d.t. (or e.s.t.), Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays. An electronic version of this document is available on the World Wide Web at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

Privacy Act: 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>.

(Authority: 49 CFR 1.66.)

By Order of the Maritime Administrator.

Dated: May 24, 2004.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 04–12109 Filed 5–27–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket Number: MARAD–2004–17956]

Requested Administrative Waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Invitation for public comments on a requested administrative waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws for the vessel OSPREY II.

SUMMARY: As authorized by Pub. L. 105–383 and Pub. L. 107–295, the Secretary of Transportation, as represented by the Maritime Administration (MARAD), is authorized to grant waivers of the U.S.-build requirement of the coastwise laws under certain circumstances. A request for such a waiver has been received by MARAD. The vessel, and a brief description of the proposed service, is listed below. The complete application is given in DOT docket 2004–17956 at <http://dms.dot.gov>. Interested parties may comment on the effect this action may have on U.S. vessel builders or businesses in the U.S. that use U.S.-flag vessels. If MARAD determines, in accordance with Pub. L. 105–383 and MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR Part 388 (68 FR 23084; April 30, 2003), that the issuance of the waiver will have an unduly adverse effect on a U.S.-vessel builder or a business that uses U.S.-flag vessels in that business, a waiver will not be granted. Comments should refer to the docket number of this notice and the vessel name in order for MARAD to properly consider the comments. Comments should also state the commenter's interest in the waiver application, and address the waiver criteria given in § 388.4 of MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR Part 388.

DATES: Submit comments on or before June 28, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to docket number MARAD–2004–17956. Written comments may be submitted by hand or by mail to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL–401, Department of Transportation, 400 7th St., SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. You may also send comments electronically via the Internet at <http://dmses.dot.gov/submit/>. All comments will become part of this docket and will

be available for inspection and copying at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. An electronic version of this document and all documents entered into this docket is available on the World Wide Web at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael Hokana, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, MAR-830 Room 7201, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202-366-0760.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: As described by the applicant the intended service of the vessel *OSPREY II* is:

Intended Use: "Charter fishing."

Geographic Region: "Coast of Maine to Brownsville, Texas and the Caribbean Islands."

Dated: May 24, 2004.

By order of the Maritime Administrator.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 04-12108 Filed 5-27-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-81-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2004-17902; Notice 1]

Volkswagen of America, Inc., Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Volkswagen of America, Inc. (Volkswagen) has determined that certain vehicles that were produced by Volkswagen AG and AUDI AG in 2004 do not comply with S4.2.2(a) of 49 CFR 571.114, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 114, "Theft protection." Volkswagen has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports."

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h), Volkswagen has petitioned for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

This notice of receipt of Volkswagen's petition is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the petition.

Approximately 47,962 model year 2004 vehicles are affected including approximately 37,663 Touareg, approximately 2,268 Phaeton and approximately 8,031 Audi A8L vehicles.

S4.2.2(a) of FMVSS No. 114 requires that

* * * provided that steering is prevented upon the key's removal, each vehicle * * * [which has an automatic transmission with a "park" position] may permit key removal when electrical failure of this [key-locking] system * * * occurs or may have a device which, when activated, permits key removal.

In the affected vehicles, the steering does not lock when the key is removed using the override system provided to permit key removal when the transmission is not in the "park" position.

Volkswagen believes that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety and that no corrective action is warranted. Volkswagen states the following in its petition:

The ignition key/transmission interlock requirements of S4.2 were enacted in Docket 1-21, Notice 9 published May 30, 1990. In that amendment, there was no provision for an override to permit key removal if the transmission was not in the PARK position. In response to petitions for reconsideration and comments to the original NPRM by Toyota, Nissan, Subaru and the Rover Group, NHTSA published Docket 1-21, Notice 10 on March 26, 1991 to revise S4.2 by adding S4.2.1 and S4.2.2 which permitted an override device located behind a non-transparent cover that must be removed with the use of a tool. The activation of the override could permit removal of the key even though the transmission is not in PARK. An override could also permit moving the transmission out of the PARK position after removal of the key. The condition required for the operation of the override device in each case was that the steering would be prevented when the key is removed.

Toyota and Honda filed petitions for reconsideration to the March 1991 Final Rule amendment and these were responded to in Docket 1-21, Notice 11 on January 17, 1992. In Notice 11, NHTSA amended S4.2.2(a) to clarify that key removal is permitted even though the transmission was not in PARK without the activation of the override device in the event of vehicle electrical failure. However, removal of the key with the transmission not in PARK under conditions when the vehicle has normal electric power would only be permitted with the use of the override device. The condition for permitting key removal under any situation when the transmission was not in PARK was that the steering would be prevented when the key is removed.

The provision that the steering must be locked when the key is removed was discussed in both Notice 10 (56 FR 12467, March 20, 1991) and in Notice 11 (57 FR 2040, January 17, 1992) and the stated intent was "to ensure that Standard No. 114's theft protection aspects are not jeopardized." There is no indication that the requirement for the steering to be locked was based on any need to prevent personal injury or property damage.

Volkswagen states that it believes the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety because the presence or absence of a steering lock when the vehicle is without power and the key removed has no significance to motor vehicle safety. Volkswagen explains:

In the Volkswagen and Audi car lines for which this petition is submitted, the ability to remove the key with the override system is the priority security and safety feature (to the extent that it prevents a stolen vehicle from being driven) because the vehicles are equipped with an electronic immobilizer which prevents starting of the vehicle unless the electronically coded key provided for that vehicle is used. The code to start the engine and activate the fuel and ignition system is embedded in the engine control module and therefore cannot be bypassed or defeated. If the key cannot be removed in the event of vehicle power failure, the owner will not be able to lock the vehicle and the car can be started and driven by anyone who can get it repaired, which is as simple as a jump start.

Volkswagen asserts that there is no risk to motor vehicle safety from using the override device to remove the key when the transmission is not in "park" when there is no vehicle power failure because this would occur only in a repair shop or under supervised conditions when the vehicle must be moved but it is desired to remove the key for security reasons. Volkswagen states that in this case, the electronic immobilizer provides anti-theft protection and the steering lock is not significant.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on the petition described above. Comments must refer to the docket and notice number cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted by any of the following methods. Mail: Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, Nassif Building, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001. Hand Delivery: Room PL-401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC. It is requested, but not required, that two copies of the comments be provided. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. except Federal Holidays. Comments may be submitted electronically by logging onto the Docket Management System Web site at <http://dms.dot.gov>. Click on "Help" to obtain instructions for filing the document electronically. Comments may be faxed to 1-202-493-2251, or may be submitted to the Federal eRulemaking Portal: go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.