

procedures for renewing exemptions from the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). Specifically, Advocates objects to the agency's extension of the exemptions without any opportunity for public comment prior to the decision to renew, and reliance on a summary statement of evidence to make its decision to extend the exemption of each driver.

The issues raised by Advocates were addressed at length in 69 FR 51346 (August 18, 2004). The FMCSA continues to find its exemption process appropriate to the statutory and regulatory requirements.

Issued on: August 19, 2004.

**Rose A. McMurray,**

*Associate Administrator, Policy and Program Development.*

[FR Doc. 04-19567 Filed 8-26-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-EX-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Transit Administration

[FTA Docket No. FTA-2004-18959]

#### Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review

**AGENCY:** Federal Transit Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for extension of the currently approved information collection. The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments was published on June 1, 2004.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted before September 27, 2004. A comment to OMB is most effective if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Sylvia L. Marion, Office of Administration, Office of Management Planning, (202) 366-6680.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title:* Reporting of Technical Activities by FTA Grant Recipients (*OMB Number: 2132-0549*).

*Abstract:* 49 U.S.C. Sections 5303 and 5313(a) and (b) authorize the use of federal funds to assist metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), states, and local public bodies in developing transportation plans and programs to serve future transportation needs of

urbanized areas and nonurbanized areas throughout the nation. As part of this effort, MPOs are required to consider a wide range of goals and objectives and to analyze alternative transportation system management and investment strategies. These objectives are measured by definable activities such as planning certification reviews and other related activities.

The information collected is used to report annually to Congress, the Secretary, and to the Federal Transit Administrator on how grantees are responding to national emphasis areas and congressional direction, and allows FTA to trace grantees' use of federal planning and research funds.

*Estimated Annual Burden:* 156 hours.

**ADDRESSES:** All written comments must refer to the docket number that appears at the top of this document and be submitted to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725-17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention: FTA 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; the accuracy of the Department's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; 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.

Issued: August 24, 2004.

**Ann M. Linnertz,**

*Deputy Associate Administrator for Administration.*

[FR Doc. 04-19633 Filed 8-26-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-57-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

#### Denial of Motor Vehicle Recall Petition

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

**ACTION:** Denial of petition for an investigation into the adequacy of a safety recall.

**SUMMARY:** This notice sets forth the reasons for the denial of a petition submitted to NHTSA under 49 U.S.C. 30120(e) by Ms. Angelique Trowbridge, requesting that the agency commence a

proceeding to determine the adequacy of the remedy utilized by Ford Motor Company (Ford) to address a safety-related defect in Ford Safety Recall 04S13 (NHTSA 04V-165). After a review of the petition and other information, NHTSA has concluded that further expenditure of the agency's investigative resources on the issues raised by the petition does not appear warranted. The agency accordingly has denied the petition. The petition is hereinafter identified as RP04-002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Thomas Z. Cooper, Chief, Vehicle Integrity Division, Office of Defects Investigation (ODI), NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: (202) 366-5218.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On June 22, 2004, NHTSA received a letter from Ms. Trowbridge requesting that the agency investigate the adequacy of the remedy used by Ford in Safety Recall 04S13 (NHTSA 04V-165). The petitioner alleges that the recall remedy is inadequate and, as evidence, states that after having the recall remedy performed on her model year (MY) 2001 Ford Escape, it did not resolve the stalling condition.

On April 5, 2004, Ford filed a Defect Information Report concerning intermittent closed throttle engine stalling in 321,903 MY 2001-2003 Ford Escape vehicles equipped with 3.0L V6 engines, manufactured between January 31, 2000 and September 11, 2002. Ford reported that an intermittent engine stalling condition is prevalent in these vehicles when the vehicle is in a closed throttle deceleration at speeds of 40 mph and below. The recall remedy involved reprogramming the calibration of the vehicle's Powertrain Control Module (PCM) to correct a rich air/fuel mixture, thereby allowing the engine to operate without experiencing a closed throttle, deceleration-stalling event.

Following receipt of the petition, on July 1, 2004, the Office of Defects Investigation (ODI) sent an information request to Ford to obtain relevant information. Ford's July 23, 2004 response indicates that less than 0.1 percent of vehicle owners who have had the recall remedy performed have reported additional deceleration stalling issues. Ford also states that the PCM has to "learn" the new program and that any subsequent stalling would be temporary. To verify Ford's claim, ODI conducted a random survey of 20 complainants who had the remedy performed on their vehicles and who experienced a subsequent stalling event. ODI found that most of them had isolated stalling problems, supporting Ford's allegation

that the PCM must "learn" the new program.

In addition, in a phone conversation with ODI, the petitioner stated that a Ford engineer found a faulty ignition switch as the cause of the stalling in her vehicle. Thus, there is no evidence at this time to suggest that the recall remedy is inadequate.

For the foregoing reasons, further expenditure of the agency's investigative resources on the issues raised by the petition does not appear to be warranted. Therefore, the petition is denied.

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 30120(e); delegations of authority at CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

**Kenneth N. Weinstein,**

*Associate Administrator for Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. 04-19568 Filed 8-26-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2004-18782]

#### Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 2002 Honda CRV Multipurpose Passenger Vehicles Are Eligible for Importation

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

**ACTION:** Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 2002 Honda CRV multipurpose passenger vehicles are eligible for importation.

**SUMMARY:** This document announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that 2002 Honda CRV multipurpose passenger vehicles 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 September 27, 2004.

**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 a.m. to 5 p.m.]. 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**.

US SPECS of Aberdeen, Maryland (Registered Importer 03-321) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether nonconforming 2002 Honda CRV multipurpose passenger vehicles are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles which US SPECS believes are substantially similar are 2002 Honda CRV multipurpose passenger vehicles 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 2002 Honda CRV multipurpose passenger vehicles 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.

US SPECS submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 2002 Honda CRV multipurpose passenger vehicles 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 2002 Honda CRV multipurpose passenger vehicles 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*, 113 *Hood Latch System*, 116 *Motor Vehicle Brake Fluids*, 119 *New Pneumatic Tires for Vehicles Other than Passenger Cars*, 124 *Accelerator Control Systems*, 135 *Passenger Car Brake Systems*, 202 *Head Restraints*, 204 *Steering Control Rearward Displacement*, 205 *Glazing Materials*, 206 *Door Locks and Door Retention Components*, 207 *Seating Systems*, 210 *Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages*, 212 *Windshield Mounting*, 214 *Side Impact Protection*, 216 *Roof Crush Resistance*, 219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion*, and 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials*.

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*: modification of the speedometer to read in miles per hour.

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment*: inspection of all vehicles and installation, on vehicles that are not already so equipped, of U.S.-model headlamps, front side marker lamps, taillamp assemblies that incorporate rear side marker lamps, a high-mounted stoplamp assembly, and front and rear side reflex reflectors.

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

Standard No. 114 *Theft Protection*: installation of a key warning buzzer, if the vehicles are not already so equipped.

Standard No. 118 *Power-Operated Window, Partition, and Roof Panel Systems*: inspection of all vehicles, and