

Program Grants under 23 U.S.C. 402 and the National Priority Safety Program Grants under 23 U.S.C. 405.

Under MAP-21, the statute directs States to submit a Highway Safety Plan (HSP) that serves as a single, consolidated application for the grants. The information collected as part of the required HSP includes information on the highway safety planning process, performance plan, highway safety strategies and projects, performance report, program cost summary, certifications and assurances, and an application for Section 405 grants. In general, a State is required to submit information to the agency that supports its qualifications for receiving grant funds.

Consistent with the statute, the agency published an interim final rule creating an application process for States to apply for these grant funds. An additional section of the interim final rule explained the agency's information collection request identifying the affected public and estimating the burden hours.

The estimated burden hours for the collection of information were based on all eligible respondents (i.e., applicants) for each of the grants:

- Section 402 grants: 57 (fifty States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Secretary of the Interior);
- Section 405(f) grants: 52 (fifty States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico);
- Section 405(a)–(e), (g) grants: 56 (fifty States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands).

The agency estimated that it would take each respondent approximately 240 hours to collect, review and submit the reporting information to NHTSA for the Section 402 program and further estimated that it would take each respondent approximately 180 hours to collect, review and submit the reporting information to NHTSA for the Section 405 program. Based on the above information, the estimated annual burden hours for all respondents is 23,940 hours.

Assuming the average salary of these individuals is \$50.00 per hour, the estimated cost for each respondent is \$21,000; the estimated total cost for all respondents is \$1,197,000. (This represents a reduced burden estimate from the interim final rule to reflect that this notice does not include burden estimates for the program cost summary

information included with the HSP (i.e., HS-217 form). This information is collected under a previously approved information collection request (OMB Control Number 2127-0003.))

These estimates present the highest possible burden hours and amounts possible. All States do not apply for and receive a grant each year under each of these programs.

In response to the information collection request published in the interim final rule, the agency received one comment from the Montana Department of Transportation referencing paperwork reduction act criteria. The commenter concludes that the agency violated the paperwork reduction act by requiring that States submit certain information with their grant applications. However, in our view, this comment concerns substantive grant application requirements, rather than identifying specific issues with paperwork reduction act compliance. As a result, we will respond to this comment along with other similar comments on grant application requirements in the final rule.

*Comments are invited on:*

- Whether the 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 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.
- Please submit any comments, identified by the docket number in the heading of this document, by any of the methods described in the **ADDRESSES** section of this document. Comments are due by September 30, 2013.

**Mary D. Gunnels,**

*Associate Administrator, Regional Operations and Program Delivery.*

[FR Doc. 2013-21037 Filed 8-28-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

#### Petition for Exemption From the Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Fuji Heavy Industries U.S.A., Inc.

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

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

**SUMMARY:** This document grants in full Fuji Heavy Industries U.S.A., Inc.'s (FUSA) petition for exemption of the Subaru [confidential] vehicle line in accordance with 49 CFR part 543, *Exemption from the 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 of the Theft Prevention Standard 49 CFR part 541, *Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard*. FUSA requested confidential treatment for specific information in its petition. The agency has addressed FUSA's request for confidential treatment by letter dated June 28, 2013. However, FUSA has stated that it will provide the agency with the nameplate of the vehicle prior to its introduction for sale into commerce in order to allow the agency to notify law enforcement agencies and the public of a new vehicle line exempted from the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard.

**DATES:** The exemption granted by this notice is effective beginning with the 2015 model year (MY).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Rosalind Proctor, Office of International Policy, Fuel Economy and Consumer Standards, NHTSA, W43-302, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590. Ms. Proctor's phone number is (202) 366-4807. Her fax number is (202) 493-0073.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In a petition dated June 6, 2013, FUSA requested an exemption from the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standard (49 CFR part 541) for the Subaru [confidential] vehicle line, beginning with the 2015 MY. The petition has been filed pursuant to 49 CFR part 543, *Exemption from Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard*, based on the installation of an antitheft device as standard equipment for an entire vehicle line.

Under § 543.5(a), a manufacturer may petition NHTSA to grant an exemption for one vehicle line per model year. In its petition, FUSA provided a detailed description and diagram of the identity, design, and location of the components of the antitheft device for the Subaru [confidential] vehicle line. FUSA stated that it will install a passive, electronic-immobilizer antitheft device as standard equipment on its Subaru [confidential] vehicle line. The device will control

engine ignition, fuel delivery and starter motor operation.

FUSA stated that its device immobilization will facilitate and encourage activation by motorists because it requires nothing more than normal removal of the key from the ignition switch when the vehicle is not in use. The device will also include a visible and audible alarm with a panic mode feature. The alarm system will monitor the vehicle's door status and key identification. Any unauthorized effort to open a door or enter or move the vehicle will activate the alarm system causing the horn to sound and the hazard lamps to flash. FUSA'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, FUSA provided information on the reliability and durability of its proposed device. To ensure reliability and durability of the device, FUSA conducted tests based on its own specified standards and provided a list of information of the tests it conducted. FUSA believes that its device is reliable and durable because the device complied with its own specific requirements for each test. Additionally, FUSA stated that because the immobilization features are designed and constructed within the vehicle's overall Controller Area Network Electrical Architecture, the antitheft device cannot be separated and controlled independently of this network. Furthermore, availability of a correct key will not defeat the electronic immobilization features of the key/vehicle antitheft device interface.

FUSA stated that it believes that historically, NHTSA has seen a decreasing theft rate trend when electronic immobilization has been added to alarm systems. FUSA stated that it presently has immobilizer devices on all of its product lines (Forester, Tribeca, Impreza, XV Crosstrek, Legacy, and Outback models) and it believes the data shows immobilization has had a demonstrable effect in lowering its theft rates. FUSA also noted that recent state-by-state theft results from the National Insurance Crime Bureau reported that in only 6 of the 50 states listed in its results, and the District of Columbia, not any Subaru vehicle appeared in its top 10 list of stolen vehicles. Review of the theft rates published by the agency for Subaru vehicles through the years (2007–2010) revealed that, while there is some variation, the theft rates for Subaru

vehicles have on average, remained below the median theft rate of 3.5826.

FUSA also provided a comparative table showing how its device is similar to other manufacturers' devices that have already been granted an exemption by NHTSA. In its comparison, FUSA makes note of **Federal Register** notices published by NHTSA in which manufacturers have stated that they have seen reductions in theft due to the immobilization systems being used. Specifically, FUSA notes claims by Ford Motor Company that its 1997 Mustangs with immobilizers saw a 70% reduction in theft compared to its 1995 Mustangs without immobilizers. FUSA also noted its reliance on theft rates published by the agency which showed that theft rates were lower for Jeep Grand Cherokee immobilizer-equipped vehicles (model year 1999 through 2003) compared to older parts-marked Jeep Grand Cherokee vehicles (model year 1995 through 1998). FUSA stated that it believes its device is likely to be no less effective than those installed on lines for which the agency has already granted full exemption from the parts-marking requirements.

The agency agrees that the device is substantially similar to devices in other vehicles lines for which the agency has already granted exemptions. Based on the evidence submitted by FUSA, the agency believes that the antitheft device for the Subaru [confidential] 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 541).

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 33106 and 49 CFR 543.7(b), the agency grants a petition for an exemption from the parts-marking requirements of part 541 either in whole or in part, if it determines that, based upon substantial evidence, the standard equipment antitheft device is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of part 541. The agency finds that FUSA has provided adequate reasons for its belief that the antitheft device will reduce and deter theft. This conclusion is based on the information FUSA provided about its device.

The agency concludes that the device will provide the five types of performance listed in § 543.6(a)(3): promoting activation; attracting attention to the efforts of unauthorized persons to enter or operate a vehicle by means other than a key; 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.

For the foregoing reasons, the agency hereby grants in full FUSA's petition for exemption for the Subaru 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, 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 FUSA 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 FUSA 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: August 16, 2013.

**Christopher J. Bonanti,**  
Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 2013–21125 Filed 8–28–13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–59–P**