

Additionally, the Ford Focus will have an optional perimeter alarm system which will monitor all the doors, decklid and hood of the vehicle. Ford'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.

The Ford SecuriLock is a transponder-based electronic immobilizer system. Ford stated that the integration of the transponder into the normal operation of the ignition key assures activation of the system. When the ignition key is turned to the start position, the transceiver module reads the ignition key code and transmits an encrypted message to the cluster. Validation of the key is determined and start of the engine is authorized once a separate encrypted message is sent to the powertrain's electronic control module (PCM). The powertrain will function only if the key code matches the unique identification key code previously programmed into the PCM. If the codes do not match, the powertrain engine starter will be disabled.

The effectiveness of Ford's SecuriLock device was first introduced as standard equipment on its MY 1996 Mustang GT and Cobra. In MY 1997, the SecuriLock system was installed on the entire Mustang vehicle line as standard equipment. Ford stated that the 1997 model year Mustang with SecuriLock shows a 70% reduction in theft compared to the MY 1995 Mustang, according to National Insurance Crime Bureau (NICB) theft statistics. There were 149 reported theft for 1997 compared to 500 reported thefts in 1995.

In addressing the specific content requirements of 543.6, Ford provided information on the reliability and durability of its proposed device. To ensure reliability and durability of the device, Ford conducted tests based on its own specified standards. Ford 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. Ford also stated that the SecuriLock electronic engine immobilizer device makes conventional theft methods such as hot-wiring or attacking the ignition lock cylinder ineffective and virtually eliminates drive-away thefts.

Ford also compared the device proposed for its vehicle line with other devices which NHTSA has determined to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as would compliance with the parts-marking requirements. Ford finds that the lack of an alarm or attention attracting device

does not compromise the theft deterrent performance of a system such as the SecuriLock. Ford stated that its proposed device is functionally equivalent to the systems used in previous vehicle lines which were deemed effective and granted exemptions from the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standard. Additionally, theft data have indicated a decline in theft rates for vehicle lines that have been equipped with antitheft devices similar to that which Ford proposes to install on the new line. In these instances, the agency has concluded that the lack of a visual or audio alarm has not prevented these antitheft devices from being effective protection against theft.

On the basis of this comparison, Ford has concluded that the antitheft device proposed for its Focus 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 Ford, the agency believes that the antitheft device for the Focus 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 (49 CFR Part 541).

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.

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 33106 and 49 CFR 543.6 (a)(4) and (5), the agency finds that Ford has provided adequate reasons for its belief that the antitheft device will reduce and deter theft. This conclusion is based on the information Ford provided about its device.

For the foregoing reasons, the agency hereby grants in full Ford's petition for exemption for the Focus 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 543.7(f) contains publication requirements incident to the disposition of all Part 543 petitions. Advanced listing, including the release of future product nameplates, the beginning model year for which the petition is granted and a general description of the antitheft device 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 Ford 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 541.5 and 541.6 (marking of major component parts and replacement parts).

NHTSA notes that if Ford 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 anti-theft device on which the line's exemption is based. Further, § 543.9(c)(2) provides for the submission of petitions "to modify an exemption to permit the use of an antitheft device similar to but differing from the one specified in that exemption."

The agency wishes to minimize the administrative burden that Part 543.9(c)(2) could place on exempted vehicle manufacturers and itself. The agency did not intend Part 543 to require the submission of a modification petition for every change to the components or design of an antitheft device. The significance of many such changes could be *de minimis*. Therefore, NHTSA suggests that if the manufacturer contemplates making any changes the effects of which might be characterized as *de minimis*, it should consult the agency before preparing and submitting a petition to modify.

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 33106; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.

Issued on: February 8, 2006.

**Stephen R. Kratzke,**

*Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.*

[FR Doc. E6-2053 Filed 2-13-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

[Docket: RSPA-98-4957]

### Request for Public Comments and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Approval of an Existing Information Collection (2137-0589)

**AGENCY:** Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), DOT.

**SUMMARY:** This notice requests public participation in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval process for the renewal of an existing PHMSA information collection.

In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) described below has been forwarded to OMB for extension of the currently approved collection. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and the expected burden. PHMSA published a **Federal Register** Notice soliciting comments on the following information collection and received none. The purpose of this notice is to allow the public an additional 30 days from the date of this notice to submit comments.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before March 16, 2006.

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

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

William Fuentevilla at (202) 366-6199, or by e-mail at [William.Fuentevilla@dot.gov](mailto:William.Fuentevilla@dot.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** 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; the accuracy of the Department's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collections; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and 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. PHMSA published a **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period for this ICR on December 2, 2005 (70 FR 72323) and did not receive any comments.

This ICR relates to 49 CFR Part 194, Response Plans for Onshore Oil Pipelines. The rule requires an operator of an onshore oil pipeline facility to prepare and submit an oil spill response plan to PHMSA for review and approval when, because of its location, the facility could reasonably be expected to cause substantial harm to the environment if it were to discharge oil into navigable waters or adjoining shorelines. The rule established the planning requirements for oil spill response plans to reduce the environmental impact of oil discharged from onshore oil pipelines, as mandated by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA 90). The rule provides greater specificity and guidance to facilities than is provided in OPA 90's statutory language

to enhance private sector planning capabilities and to minimize the impacts of oil spills from pipelines.

The information collection required by the rule is the submission of response plans to PHMSA by affected pipeline operators. Additionally, operators must review and resubmit their response plans at least every 5 years, or in response to new or different operating conditions. Operators must submit any change or update to response plans within 30 days of making such a change. This information collection supports the DOT strategic goal of environmental stewardship by reducing pollution and other adverse environmental effects of transportation and transportation facilities.

As used in this notice, "information collection" includes all work related to preparing and disseminating information related to this recordkeeping requirement including completing paperwork, gathering information, and conducting telephone calls.

*Type of Information Collection Request:* Renewal of Existing Collection.

*Title of Information Collection:* Response Plans for Onshore Oil Pipelines.

*Respondents:* 367 hazardous liquid pipeline facilities.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:* 50,186 hours.

Issued in Washington DC, on February 8, 2006.

**Florence L. Hamn,**

*Director of Regulations, Office of Pipeline Safety.*

[FR Doc. 06-1355 Filed 2-13-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-60-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

[OMB Control No. 2900-0673]

### Proposed Information Collection

**Activity: Proposed Collection; Comment Request**

**AGENCY:** Human Resources and Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Human Resources and Administration (HRA), Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), is announcing an opportunity for public comment on the proposed collection of certain information by the agency. Under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, Federal agencies are required to publish notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of

information, including each proposed extension of a currently approved collection, and allow 60 days for public comment in response to the notice. This notice solicits comments on information needed to issue a One-VA identification verification card.

**DATES:** Written comments and recommendations on the proposed collection of information should be received on or before April 17, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit written comments on the collection of information to Joseph Bond, Human Resources and Administration (006C), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20420 or e-mail: [joseph.bond@va.gov](mailto:joseph.bond@va.gov). Please refer to "OMB Control No. 2900-0673" in any correspondence.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Joseph Bond at (202) 273-7109 or fax (202) 273-4877.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under the PRA of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13; 44 U.S.C. 3501-3521), Federal agencies must obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for each collection of information they conduct or sponsor. This request for comment is being made pursuant to Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA.

With respect to the following collection of information, HRA invites comments on: (1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of HRA's functions, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) the accuracy of HRA's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or the use of other forms of information technology.

*Title:* Request for One-VA

Identification Card, VA Form 0711.

*OMB Control Number:* 2900-0673.

*Type of Review:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

*Abstract:* VA Form 0711 is used to collect pertinent information from employees, VA applicants seeking employment with VA, contractors, and affiliates (such as students, WOC employees and others) prior to issuing a Department identification credential. The data collected will be used to personalize, print, and issue a personal identity verification card.

*Affected Public:* Federal government, Individuals or households, and Business or other for-profits.