

of vehicle manufacturers and alterers under 49 CFR part 567. Therefore, lift manufacturers must produce an insert that is placed in the vehicle owner's manual, installation instructions and one or two labels that are placed near the controls of the lift. The requirements and our estimates of the hour burden and cost to lift manufacturers are given below. There is no burden to the general public.

*Affected Public:* Platform lift manufacturers and vehicle manufacturers/alterers that install platform lifts in new motor vehicles before first retail sale.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden:* 144 hours and \$9,315.32.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments, within 30 days, to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention NHTSA Desk Officer.

#### Comments Are Invited On

- Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility.
- Whether the Department's estimate for the burden of the proposed information collection is accurate.
- Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

A comment to OMB is most effective if OMB receives it prior to November 18, 2005.

Issued on: October 13, 2005.

**Stephen R. Kratzke,**

*Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.*

[FR Doc. 05-20891 Filed 10-18-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

#### Reports, Forms and Recordkeeping Requirements Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), U.S. Department of Transportation.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office

of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The ICR describes the nature of the information collections and their expected burden. The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period was published on May 11, 2005 [70 FR 24860]. This is a request for a new collection.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before November 18, 2005.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Donovan Green, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Room 5307, NVS-122, Washington, DC 20590. Mr. Green's telephone number is (202) 493-0248.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

*Title:* Tires and Rim Labeling.

*OMB Control Number:* 2127-0503.

*Form Number:* This collection of information uses no standard forms.

*Requested Expiration Date of Approval:* Three years from the approval date.

*Type of Request:* Request for public comment on a previously approved collection of information.

*Abstract:* Each tire manufacturer and rim manufacturer must label their tire or rim with the applicable safety information. These labeling requirements ensure that tires are mounted on the appropriate rims; and that the rims and tires are mounted on the vehicles for which they are intended.

*Affected Public:* Tire and Rim Manufacturers.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden:* \$3,611,460.00.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments, within 30 days, to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention NHTSA Desk Officer.

#### Comments Are Invited On:

- Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility.
- Whether the Department's estimate for the burden of the proposed information collection is accurate.
- Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

A comment to OMB is most effective if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication.

Issued on: October 7, 2005.

**Roger A. Saul,**

*Director, Office of Crashworthiness Standards.*

[FR Doc. 05-20892 Filed 10-18-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2005-22644]

#### Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 2001 Bentley Arnage Passenger Cars, Manufactured From January 1, 2001, Through December 31, 2001, Are Eligible for Importation

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

**ACTION:** Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 2001 Bentley Arnage passenger cars, manufactured from January 1, 2001 through December 31, 2001, 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 Bentley Arnage passenger cars, manufactured from January 1, 2001, through December 31, 2001, 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 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, and (2) they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

**DATES:** The closing date for comments on the petition is November 18, 2005.

**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 am to 5 pm]. 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.

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**.

Automobile Concepts, Inc. ("AMC"), of North Miami, Florida (Registered Importer 01-278) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether nonconforming 2001 Bentley Arnage passenger cars, manufactured from January 1, 2001, through December 31, 2001, are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles which AMC believes are substantially similar are 2001 Bentley Arnage passenger cars, manufactured from January 1, 2001, through December 31, 2001, that were manufactured for importation into, and sale in, the United States and certified by their manufacturer as conforming to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared non-U.S. certified 2001 Bentley Arnage passenger cars, manufactured from January 1, 2001, through December 31, 2001, to their U.S.-certified counterparts, and found the vehicles to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

AMC submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 2001 Bentley Arnage passenger cars, manufactured from

January 1, 2001, through December 31, 2001, as originally manufactured, conform to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as their U.S. certified counterparts, or are capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that non-U.S. certified 2001 Bentley Arnage passenger cars, manufactured from January 1, 2001, through December 31, 2001, are identical to their U.S. certified counterparts with respect to compliance with Standard Nos. 102 *Transmission Shift Lever Sequence, Starter Interlock, and Transmission Braking Effect*, 103 *Windshield Defrosting and Defogging Systems*, 104 *Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems*, 106 *Brake Hoses*, 109 *New Pneumatic Tires*, 113 *Hood Latch System*, 116 *Motor Vehicle Brake Fluids*, 124 *Accelerator Control Systems*, 135 *Passenger Car Brake Systems*, 201 *Occupant Protection in Interior Impact*, 202 *Head Restraints*, 204 *Steering Control Rearward Displacement*, 205 *Glazing Materials*, 206 *Door Locks and Door Retention Components*, 207 *Seating Systems*, 212 *Windshield Mounting*, 214 *Side Impact Protection*, 216 *Roof Crush Resistance*, 219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion*, 225 *Child Restraint Anchorage Systems*, and 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials*.

The petitioner states that the vehicles also conform to the Bumper Standard found in 49 CFR part 581.

The 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*: installation of a U.S.-model speedometer reading in miles per hour.

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment*: inspection of all vehicles and installation of U.S.-model components, on vehicles that are not already so equipped, to ensure compliance with the standard.

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

Standard No. 111 *Rearview Mirrors*: installation of a U.S.-model passenger side rearview mirror, or inscription of the required warning statement on the face of that mirror.

Standard No. 114 *Theft Protection*: installation of U.S. version software, or installation of a supplemental key warning system to meet the requirements of this standard.

Standard No. 118 *Power-Operated Window, Partition, and Roof Panel Systems*: installation of U.S. version software to ensure that the systems meet the requirements of this standard.

Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*: (a) installation of U.S. version software to ensure that the seat belt warning system meets the requirements of this standard, and (b) inspection of all vehicles and replacement of any non-U.S.-model components needed to achieve conformity with this standard with U.S.-model components.

Petitioner states that the vehicles are equipped with airbags and knee bolsters at the front outboard seating positions, and with combination lap and shoulder belts at the front and rear designated seating positions.

Standard No. 209 *Seat Belt Assemblies*: inspection of all vehicles and replacement of any non-U.S.-model seat belts with U.S.-model components on vehicles that are not already so equipped.

Standard No. 210 *Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages*: inspection of all vehicles and replacement of any non-U.S.-model seat belt anchorage components with U.S.-model components on vehicles that are not already so equipped.

Standard No. 301 *Fuel System Integrity*: inspection of all vehicles and installation of U.S.-model components on vehicles that are not already so equipped.

Standard No. 401 *Interior Trunk Release*: for vehicles manufactured after August 31, 2001, installation of U.S.-model components on vehicles that are not already so equipped.

The petitioner additionally states that a vehicle identification plate must be affixed to the vehicles near the left windshield post to meet the requirements of 49 CFR part 565.

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)(A) and (b)(1); 49 CFR 593.8; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

**Claude H. Harris,**

*Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.*  
[FR Doc. 05-20871 Filed 10-18-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

#### Petition for Exemption From the Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Mitsubishi Motors

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Grant of petition for exemption.

**SUMMARY:** This document grants in full the petition of Mitsubishi Motors R&D of America (Mitsubishi), for an exemption in accordance with § 543.9(c)(2) of 49 CFR Part 543, *Exemption from the Theft Prevention Standard*, for the Mitsubishi Endeavor vehicle line beginning with model year (MY) 2006. This petition is granted because the agency has determined that the antitheft device to be placed on the Endeavor vehicle line as standard equipment is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard. Mitsubishi requested confidential treatment for the information and attachments it submitted in support of its petition. The agency will consider the petitioner's request for confidential treatment and will respond by separate letter.

**DATES:** The exemption granted by this notice is effective beginning September 1, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Carlita Ballard, Office of International Policy, Fuel Economy and Consumer Programs, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Ms. Ballard's telephone number is (202) 366-0846. Her fax number is (202) 493-2290.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In a petition dated February 25, 2005, Mitsubishi requested exemption from the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standard (49 CFR Part 541) for the Mitsubishi Endeavor vehicle line beginning with MY 2006. The petition requested an exemption from parts-marking pursuant to 49 CFR 543, *Exemption from Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard*, based on the installation of an antitheft device as

standard equipment for the entire vehicle line. Subsequently, the agency notified Mitsubishi of the areas of deficiency in its petition for exemption. Mitsubishi was also informed that its submission would be considered incomplete until such time the supplementary information addressing the areas of deficiency had been received. The agency received Mitsubishi's supplementary information on July 11, 2005.

Under § 543.5(a), a manufacturer may petition NHTSA to grant exemptions for one line of its vehicle lines per year. In its petition, Mitsubishi provided a detailed description and diagram of the identity, design, and location of the components of the antitheft device for the new vehicle line. Mitsubishi will install its passive, electronic immobilizer antitheft device as standard equipment beginning with MY 2006. Mitsubishi's submission is considered a complete petition as required by 49 CFR 543.7, in that it meets the general requirements contained in 543.5 and the specific content requirements of 543.6.

In addressing the specific content requirements of 543.6, Mitsubishi provided information on the reliability and durability of its proposed device. To ensure reliability and durability of the device, Mitsubishi conducted tests based on its own specified standards. Mitsubishi also provided a detailed list of the tests conducted and believes that the device is reliable and durable since the device complied with its specified requirements for each test.

Mitsubishi compared the device proposed for its vehicle line with devices which NHTSA has determined to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as would compliance with the parts-marking requirements. Mitsubishi's proposed device, as well as other comparable devices that have received full exemptions from the parts-marking requirements, lack an audible and visible alarm. Therefore, these devices cannot perform one of the functions listed in 49 CFR 542.6(a)(3), that is, to call attention to unauthorized attempts to enter or move the vehicle. However, theft data have indicated a decline in theft rates for vehicle lines that have been equipped with antitheft devices similar to that which Mitsubishi purposes. In these instances, the agency has concluded that the lack of a visual or audible alarm has not prevented these antitheft devices from being effective protection against theft.

On the basis of this comparison, Mitsubishi has concluded that the antitheft device proposed for its vehicle line is no less effective than those

devices in the lines for which NHTSA has already granted full exemption from the parts-marking requirements.

Based on the evidence submitted by Mitsubishi, the agency believes that the antitheft device for the Mitsubishi vehicle line is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard.

The agency concludes that the device will provide four of the five types of performance listed in § 543.6(a)(3): Promoting activation; preventing defeat or circumvention of the device by unauthorized persons; preventing operation of the vehicle by unauthorized entrants; and ensuring the reliability and durability of the device.

As required by 49 U.S.C. 33106 and 49 CFR 543.6(a)(4) and (5), the agency finds that Mitsubishi has provided adequate reasons for its belief that the antitheft device will reduce and deter theft. This conclusion is based on the information Mitsubishi provided about its device, much of which is confidential. This confidential information included a description of reliability and functional tests conducted by Mitsubishi for the antitheft device and its components.

For the foregoing reasons, the agency hereby grants in full Mitsubishi's petition for exemption of its Endeavor vehicle line from the parts-marking requirements of 49 CFR part 541. The agency notes that 49 CFR part 541, Appendix A-1, identifies those lines that are exempted from the Theft Prevention Standard for a given model year. 49 CFR part 543.7(f) contains publication requirements incident to the disposition of all Part 543 petitions. Advanced listing, including the release of future product nameplates, is necessary in order to notify law enforcement agencies of new vehicle lines exempted from the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard.

If Mitsubishi decides not to use the exemption for this line, it must formally notify the agency, and, thereafter, the line must be fully marked as required by 49 CFR parts 541.5 and 541.6 (marking of major component parts and replacement parts).

NHTSA notes that if Mitsubishi wishes in the future to modify the device on which this exemption is based, the company may have to submit a petition to modify the exemption. Part 543.7(d) states that a Part 543 exemption applies only to vehicles that belong to a line exempted under this part and equipped with the antitheft device on which the line's exemption is based.