

towards the design of an acceptable guard. We have involved Montana State University professors from their Mechanical Engineering department. We have conducted Finite Element Analysis and traditional methods of design arriving at a plastically deforming guard that meets the standard, for nonasphalt carrying applications." The deforming guard does not retract, thus cannot be used on dump body trailers. It believes that its problem is similar to that experienced by other manufacturers manufacturing dump trailers. The company states that "devices used in other countries do not meet FMVSS 224." It continues to study "hinged/retractable devices" but must overcome lack of space for a retracted device. It will strive to develop a device that would comply with Federal requirements while an exemption is in effect.

If an exemption is not granted, substantial economic hardship will result. First, it would lose a trailer that accounts for 40 percent of its overall production. In addition, "some percentage of the remaining 60% would be lost since our customers typically purchase matching truck mounted dump bodies which may also be lost." It also believes that 31 of its 63 employees would have to be laid off if its application is denied. Maintenance of full employment would be in the public interest it argues. Beall's net income was \$39,317 in 1996 and \$72,213 in 1996. In the first 10 months of 1997, its net income before income taxes was \$697,040. If the application is denied, it foresees a net loss of \$71,445 for 1998.

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on the petition described above. Comments should refer to the docket and notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Management, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. It is requested but not required that 10 copies be submitted.

All comments received before the close of business on the comment closing date below will be considered, and will be available for examination in the docket at the above address both before and after that date, between the hours of 10 a.m. and 5 p.m. 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.

Comment closing date: June 8, 1998.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30113; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.4

Issued on: May 13, 1998.

L. Robert Shelton,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 98-13276 Filed 5-18-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Petition for Exemption From the Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Nissan

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

ACTION: Grant of petition for exemption.

SUMMARY: This notice grants in full the petition of Nissan North America, Inc., (Nissan) for an exemption of a high-theft line (whose nameplate is confidential) from the parts-marking requirements of the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention standard. This petition is granted because the agency has determined that the antitheft device to be placed on the line as standard equipment is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements.

DATES: The exemption granted by this notice is effective beginning with the (confidential) model year.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Rosalind Proctor, Office of Planning and Consumer Programs, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Ms. Proctor's telephone number is (202) 366-0846. Her fax number is (202) 493-2739.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In a letter dated November 26, 1997, Nissan North America, Inc., (Nissan) requested exemption from the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standard for a motor vehicle line. The nameplate of the line and the model year of introduction are confidential. The letter requested an exemption from parts-marking pursuant to 49 CFR part 543, Exemption from Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard, based on the installation of an antitheft device as standard equipment for the entire line.

Nissan's submittal is considered a complete petition, as required by 49 CFR 543.7, in that it met the general requirements contained in § 543.5 and the specific content requirements of § 543.6. Nissan requested confidential treatment for the information submitted

in support of its petition. In a letter to Nissan dated January 13, 1998, the agency granted the petitioner's request for confidential treatment of most aspects of its petition.

In its petition, Nissan provided a detailed description and diagram of the identity, design, and location of the components of the antitheft device for the new line. This antitheft device includes an engine-immobilizer system. The antitheft device is activated by turning the ignition switch to the "OFF" position using the proper ignition key.

In order to ensure the reliability and durability of the device, Nissan conducted tests based on its own specified standards. Nissan provided a detailed list of the tests conducted. Nissan stated its belief that the device is reliable and durable since the device complied with Nissan's specified requirements for each test.

Nissan 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. Nissan's proposed device, as well as other comparable devices that have received full exemptions from the parts-marking requirements, lack an audible or 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 Nissan proposes. 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, Nissan 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 exemptions from the parts-marking requirements.

Based on the evidence submitted by Nissan, the agency believes that the antitheft device for the Nissan 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 believes that the device will provide four of the five types of performance listed in 49 CFR 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 Nissan has provided adequate reasons for its belief that the antitheft device will reduce and deter theft. This conclusion is based on the information Nissan provided about its antitheft device, much of which is confidential. This confidential information included a description of reliability and functional tests conducted by Nissan for the antitheft device and its components.

For the foregoing reasons, the agency hereby grants in full Nissan's petition for exemption for the vehicle line from the parts-marking requirements of 49 CFR part 541. The agency notes that 49 CFR part 541, appendix A-I identifies those lines that are exempted from the theft prevention standard for a given model year. Advance listing, including the release of future product nameplates, is necessary in order to notify law enforcement agencies of new models exempted from the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard. Therefore, since Nissan has been granted confidential treatment for the nameplate of its vehicle, the confidential status of the nameplate will be protected until, but no later than, June 1, prior to the model year of its introduction into the marketplace. At that time, Appendix A-I will be revised to reflect the nameplate of Nissan's exempted vehicle line.

If Nissan decides not to use the exemption or 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 Nissan 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. Section

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. 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 which § 543.9(c)(2) could place on exempted vehicle manufacturers and itself. The agency did not intend in drafting 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: May 12, 1998.

L. Robert Shelton,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 98-13252 Filed 5-18-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Research and Special Programs Administration Office of Hazardous Materials Safety

Notice of Applications for Exemptions

AGENCY: Research and Special Programs Administration, Office of Hazardous Materials Safety, DOT.

ACTION: List of Applicants for Exemptions.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the procedures governing the application for, and the processing of, exemptions from the Department of Transportation's Hazardous Materials Regulations (49 CFR Part 107, Subpart B), notice is hereby given that the Office of Hazardous Materials Safety has received the applications described herein. Each mode of transportation for which a particular exemption is requested is indicated by a number in the "Nature of Application" portion of the table below as follows: 1—Motor vehicle, 2—Rail freight, 3—Cargo vessel, 4—Cargo aircraft only, 5—Passenger-carrying aircraft.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 18, 1998.

ADDRESS COMMENTS TO: Dockets Unit, Research and Special Programs Administration, Room 8421, DHM-30, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, DC 20590.

Comments should refer to the application number and be submitted in triplicate. If confirmation of receipt of comments is desired, include a self-addressed stamped postcard showing the exemption application number.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Copies of the applications (See Docket Number) are available for inspection at the New Docket Management Facility, PL-401, at the U.S. Department of Transportation, Nassif Building, 400 7th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590.

This notice of receipt of applications for new exemptions is published in accordance with Part 107 of the Hazardous Materials Regulations Act (49 U.S.C. 1806; 49 CFR 1.53(e)).

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 14, 1998.

J. Suzanne Hedgepeth,

Director, Office of Hazardous Materials, Exemptions and Approvals.

NEW EXEMPTIONS

Application No.	Docket No.	Applicant	Regulation(s) affected	Nature of exemption thereof
12063-N	RPSA-1998-3827	The Hydrocarbon Flow Specialist, Inc., Morgan City, LA.	49 CFR 172.102, SP T-18.	To authorize the transportation in commerce of Hydrofluoric Acid solutions, Class 8, in IM 101 tanks equipped with valve to allow for bottom discharge. (Modes 1, 3.)
12064-N	RPSA-1998-3830	Occident Chemical Corp., Webster, TX.	49 CFR 180.509(e)	To authorize the requalification of tank cars using acoustic emission testing. (Mode 2.)
12065-N	RPSA-1998-3831	International Flavors & Fragrances Inc., Hazlet, NJ.	49 CFR 173.120(c)(ii) ...	To authorize the use of a specially designed device to obtain flashpoint data for fragrance formulas. (Modes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.)
12066-N	RPSA-1998-3834	KMG Bernuth Inc., Houston, TX.	49 CFR 173.35(b)	To authorize the reuse of flexible IBCs for use in transporting pentachlorophenol, Division 6.1. (Mode 1.0)