

description of the proposed service, is listed below. The complete application is given in DOT docket MARAD-2007-28175 at <http://dms.dot.gov>. Interested parties may comment on the effect this action may have on U.S. vessel builders or businesses in the U.S. that use U.S.-flag vessels. If MARAD determines, in accordance with Pub. L. 105-383 and MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR Part 388 (68 FR 23084; April 30, 2003), that the issuance of the waiver will have an unduly adverse effect on a U.S.-vessel builder or a business that uses U.S.-flag vessels in that business, a waiver will not be granted. Comments should refer to the docket number of this notice and the vessel name in order for MARAD to properly consider the comments. Comments should also state the commenter's interest in the waiver application, and address the waiver criteria given in § 388.4 of MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR Part 388.

**DATES:** Submit comments on or before June 20, 2007.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should refer to docket number MARAD-2007-28175. Written comments may be submitted by hand or by mail to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL-401, Department of Transportation, 400 7th St., SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001. You may also send comments electronically via the Internet at <http://dmses.dot.gov/submit/>. All comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection and copying at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., E.T., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. An electronic version of this document and all documents entered into this docket is available on the World Wide Web at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Joann Spittle, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., #W21-203, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202-366-5979.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** As described by the applicant the intended service of the vessel SOUND CHOICE is:  
*Intended Use:* "Passenger/sportfishing for personal use only (will be Alaska resident owned and operated)."  
*Geographic Region:* "Prince William Sound (Alaska)"

#### Privacy Act

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>.

Dated: May 10, 2007.

By order of the Maritime Administrator.

**Daron T. Threet,**

*Secretary, Maritime Administration.*

[FR Doc. E7-9661 Filed 5-18-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-81-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

#### Petition for Exemption From the Federal Motor Vehicle Motor Theft Prevention Standard; MAZDA

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

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

**SUMMARY:** This document grants in full the petition of Mazda Motor Corporation, (Mazda) for an exemption in accordance with § 543.9(c)(2) of 49 CFR Part 543, *Exemption from the Theft Prevention Standard*, for the Mazda 5 vehicle line beginning with model year (MY) 2009. 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.

**DATES:** The exemption granted by this notice is effective beginning with model year (MY) 2009.

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

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In a petition dated March 8, 2007, Mazda Motor Corporation (Mazda), requested an exemption from the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standard (49 CFR part 541) for the Mazda 5 vehicle line beginning with MY 2009. 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.

Under § 543.5(a), a manufacturer may petition NHTSA to grant exemptions for

one line of its vehicle lines per year. Mazda has petitioned the agency to grant an exemption for its Mazda 5 vehicle line beginning with MY 2009. In its petition, Mazda provided a detailed description and diagram of the identity, design, and location of the components of the antitheft device for the new vehicle line. Mazda will install its passive antitheft device as standard equipment on its 5 vehicle line. Mazda'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.

Mazda's antitheft device is activated when the driver/operator turns off the engine using a properly coded ignition key. When the ignition key is turned to the "ON" position, the transponder (located in the head of the key) transmits a code to an immobilizer control module which then communicates with the powertrain's electronic control module. The vehicle's engine can only be started if the transponder code matches the code previously programmed into the module. If the code does not match, the engine will be disabled. Mazda stated that communications between the immobilizer system control function and the powertrain's electronic control module are encrypted with 18 trillion different codes, and each transponder is hard coded with a unique code at the time of manufacture. Mazda also stated that its immobilizer system incorporates a light-emitting diode (LED) that provides information as to when the system is "set and "unset". When the ignition is initially turned to the "ON" position, a three-second continuous LED indicates the proper "unset" state of the device. When the ignition is turned to "OFF", a flashing LED indicates the "set" state of the system and provides a visual confirmation that the vehicle is protected by the immobilizer system. The integration of the setting/unsetting device (transponder) into the ignition key prevents any inadvertent activation of the system.

In addressing the specific content requirements of 543.6, Mazda provided information on the reliability and durability of its proposed device. To ensure reliability and durability of the device, Mazda conducted tests based on its own specified standards. Mazda 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. The components of the immobilizer device are tested in climatic, mechanical and chemical environments, and, immunity

to various electromagnetic radiation. Mazda stated that for reliability/durability purposes, its key and key cylinders must also meet unique strength tests against attempts of mechanical overriding. The tests conducted were for thermal shock, high temperature exposure, low-temperature exposure, thermal cycle, humidity temperature cycling, functional, random vibration, dust, water, connector and lead/lock strength, chemical resistance, electromagnetic field, power line variations, DC stresses, electrostatic discharge, transceiver/key strength and transceiver mounting strength. Mazda also stated that its device is reliable and durable because it does not have any moving parts, nor does it require a separate battery in the key. Therefore, Mazda believes that any attempt to slam-pull the ignition lock cylinder will have no effect on a thief's ability to start the vehicle, and if the correct code is not transmitted to the electronic control module there is no way to mechanically override the system and start the vehicle. Furthermore, Mazda stated that drive-away thefts are virtually eliminated with the sophisticated design and operation of the electronic-engine immobilizer system which makes conventional theft methods (*i.e.*, hot-wiring or attacking the ignition-lock cylinder) ineffective.

Additionally, Mazda reported that in MY 1996, the proposed system was installed on certain U.S. Ford vehicles as standard equipment (*i.e.* on all Ford Mustang GT and Cobra models, Ford Taurus LX, SHO and Sable LS models). In MY 1997, the immobilizer system was installed on the Ford Mustang vehicle line as standard equipment. When comparing 1995 model year Mustang vehicle thefts (without immobilizer), with MY 1997 Mustang vehicle thefts (with immobilizer), data from the National Insurance Crime Bureau showed a 70% reduction in theft. (Actual NCIC reported thefts were 500 for MY 1995 Mustang, and 149 thefts for MY 1997 Mustang.) Mazda also provided additional data from the July 2000 Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS) news release to support its belief in the reliability of its device. The IIHS news release showed an average theft reduction of about fifty percent for vehicles equipped with immobilizer systems.

Mazda'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 part 543.6(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 devices similar to that which Mazda 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.

Based on the evidence submitted by Mazda, the agency believes that the antitheft device for the Mazda 5 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).

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 part 543.6(a)(4) and (5), the agency finds that Mazda has provided adequate reasons for its belief that the antitheft device will reduce and deter theft. This conclusion is based on the information Mazda provided about its device. For the foregoing reasons, the agency hereby grants in full Mazda's petition for exemption for its 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 Mazda decides not to use the exemption for this line, it should formally notify the agency. If such a decision is made, the line must be fully marked according to the requirements under 49 CFR parts 541.5 and 541.6 (marking of major component parts and replacement parts).

NHTSA notes that if Mazda 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. Further, part 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 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 15, 2007.

**Stephen R. Kratzke,**  
Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.  
[FR Doc. E7-9666 Filed 5-18-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Surface Transportation Board

#### Notice and Request for Comments

**AGENCY:** Surface Transportation Board.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to seek approval of existing collection: Waybill Sample

---

**SUMMARY:** As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.* (PRA), the Surface Transportation Board (STB or Board) gives notice of its intent to seek from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) an approval for the currently existing collection of Waybill Sample data. This information collection is described in detail below. Comments are requested concerning: (1) The accuracy of the Board's burden estimates; (2) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; (3) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, when appropriate; and (4) whether this collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the