

variations, DC stresses, electrostatic discharge, transceiver/key strength and transceiver mounting strength. Mazda also stated that its proposed device is reliable and durable because it does not have any moving parts, nor does it require a separate battery in the key. Any attempt to slam-pull the ignition lock cylinder, for example, will have no effect on a thief's ability to start the vehicle. 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'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 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.

On the basis of this comparison, Mazda has concluded that the proposed antitheft device is no less effective than those devices installed on lines for which NHTSA has already granted full exemption from the parts-marking requirements.

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

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 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, § 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 § 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.

Dated: October 3, 2005.

**Stephen R. Kratzke,**

*Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.*

[FR Doc. 05-20184 Filed 10-6-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 34752]

#### **Watco Companies, Inc.—Continuance in Control Exemption—Louisiana Southern Railroad, Inc.**

Watco Companies, Inc. (Watco), has filed a verified notice of exemption to continue in control of the Louisiana Southern Railroad, Inc. (LSRR), upon LSRR's becoming a Class III rail carrier.<sup>1</sup>

The transaction was scheduled to be consummated on or shortly after September 25, 2005.

This transaction is related to the concurrently filed verified notice of exemption in STB Finance Docket No. 34751, *Louisiana Southern Railroad, Inc.—Lease and Operation Exemption—The Kansas City Southern Railway Company*. In that proceeding, LSRR seeks to acquire by lease from The Kansas City Southern Railway Company and operate approximately 165.8 miles of rail line extending between: (1) A point 1,600 feet south of LN&W milepost 62, near Gibsland, LA, and milepost B-192, near Pineville, LA; (2) milepost 148.8, at Winnfield, LA, and the end of the track, at Joyce, LA; (3) milepost 78.8, at Minden, LA, and milepost 83.5, at Sibley, LA; and (4) milepost 48.48, south of Springhill, LA, and milepost B-102, east of Hinkle, LA.

Watco, a Kansas corporation, is a noncarrier that currently controls 13 Class III rail carriers: South Kansas and Oklahoma Railroad Company (SKO); Palouse River & Coulee City Railroad, Inc. (PRCC); Timber Rock Railroad, Inc. (TIBR); Stillwater Central Railroad, Inc. (SLWC); Eastern Idaho Railroad, Inc. (EIRR); Kansas & Oklahoma Railroad, Inc. (K&O); Pennsylvania Southwestern Railroad, Inc. (PSWR); Great Northwest Railroad, Inc. (GNR); Kaw River Railroad, Inc. (KRR); Mission Mountain Railroad, Inc. (MMT); Appalachian & Ohio Railroad, Inc. (AO); Mississippi Southern Railroad, Inc. (MSRR); and Yellowstone Valley Railroad, Inc. (YVRR).

Applicant states that: (1) The rail lines operated by SKO, PRCC, TIBR, SLWC, EIRR, K&O, PSWR, GNR, KRR, MMT, AO, MSRR, and YVRR do not connect

<sup>1</sup> Watco owns 100% of the issued and outstanding stock of LSRR.

with the rail lines being leased by LSRR; (2) the continuance in control is not part of a series of anticipated transactions that would connect the rail lines being acquired by LSRR with any railroad in the Watco corporate family; and (3) neither LSRR nor any of the carriers controlled by Watco are Class I carriers. Therefore, the transaction is exempt from the prior approval requirements of 49 U.S.C. 11323. See 49 CFR 1180.2(d)(2). The purpose of the transaction is to reduce overhead expenses and coordinate billing, maintenance, mechanical and personnel policies and practices of applicant's rail carrier subsidiaries and thereby improve the overall efficiency of rail service provided by the 14 railroads.

Under 49 U.S.C. 10502(g), the Board may not use its exemption authority to relieve a rail carrier of its statutory obligation to protect the interests of its employees. Section 11326(c), however, does not provide for labor protection for transactions under sections 11324 and 11325 that involve only Class III rail carriers. Accordingly, the Board may not impose labor protective conditions here, because all of the carriers involved are Class III carriers.

If the verified notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio*. Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of a petition to revoke will not automatically stay the transaction.

An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to STB Finance Docket No. 34752, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board, 1925 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20423-0001. In addition, a copy of each pleading must be served on Karl Morell, Of Counsel, BALL JANIK LLP, 1455 F Street, NW., Suite 225, Washington, DC 20005.

Board decisions and notices are available on our Web site at <http://www.stb.dot.gov>.

Decided: October 3, 2005.

By the Board, David M. Konschnik, Director, Office of Proceedings.

**Vernon A. Williams,**  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 05-20244 Filed 10-6-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4915-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 34762]

#### CSX Transportation, Inc.—Temporary Trackage Rights Exemption—Alabama Great Southern Railroad Company

Alabama Great Southern Railroad Company (AGS), a subsidiary of Norfolk Southern Railway Company (the two entities will be referenced collectively as NSR) has agreed to grant temporary overhead trackage rights to CSX Transportation, Inc. (CSXT) over NSR lines running between Birmingham, AL, and Shrewsbury, LA, a total distance of approximately 355.1 miles.<sup>1</sup> Specifically, NSR has agreed to grant temporary overhead trackage rights over: (1) AGS South District between Birmingham, AL, 27th Street, milepost 142.0, and Meridian, MS, 27th Avenue, milepost 295.4; (2) NSR's trackage rights over the connection between AGS and KCSR near 27th Avenue in Meridian, MS, at milepost 295.4 and the connection between KCSR and AGS NO & NE District at milepost NO-0.4; (3) NO & NE District between Meridian, MS, 27th Avenue, milepost NO-0.4, and New Orleans, LA, Oliver Junction, milepost 194.1, and (4) New Orleans terminal Back Belt Line between New Orleans, LA, Oliver Junction, milepost 7.9 NT, and East City Junction at milepost 3.8 NT and between East City Junction at milepost 3.5 A and Shrewsbury, LA, IC Connection, milepost 0.0 A.<sup>2</sup>

The exemption became effective on September 23, 2005, and will expire on January 1, 2006.<sup>3</sup> The purpose of the temporary trackage rights is to allow CSXT to resume continuous east-west overhead service between Jacksonville, FL, and New Orleans, LA after portions of CSXT's main line between

<sup>1</sup> An incidental portion of the rail line, consisting of four-tenths of a mile, is operated by NSR via a trackage rights agreement between AGS and The Kansas City Southern Railway Company (KCSR). KCSR has consented to the use of the KCSR segment for the purposes of this transaction.

<sup>2</sup> On September 23, 2005, CSXT filed a request for a protective order and submitted a redacted version of the temporary trackage rights agreement that had been filed with the Board on September 22, 2005. CSXT stated that the unredacted version of the agreement that had been filed on September 22, 2005, contained highly sensitive data and proprietary information. It therefore asked that the unredacted version of the agreement be placed under seal and that the redacted version be placed in the public record in this proceeding. By decision served on September 28, 2005, the Board granted these requests.

<sup>3</sup> By decision served September 23, 2005, the Board granted CSXT's request for waiver of 49 CFR 1180.4(g) and allowed the exemption to become effective on September 23, 2005.

Pascagoula, MS, and New Orleans became inoperable due to damage from Hurricane Katrina.

As a condition to this exemption, any employees affected by the acquisition of the temporary trackage rights will be protected by the conditions imposed in *Norfolk and Western Ry. Co.—Trackage Rights—BN*, 354 I.C.C. 605 (1978), as modified in *Mendocino Coast Ry., Inc.—Lease and Operate*, 360 I.C.C. 653 (1980), and any employees affected by the discontinuance of those trackage rights will be protected by the conditions set out in *Oregon Short Line R. Co.—Abandonment—Goshen*, 360 I.C.C. 91 (1979).

This notice is filed under 49 CFR 1180.2(d)(8). If it contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio*. Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of a petition to revoke will not automatically stay the transaction.

An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to STB Finance Docket No. 34762, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board, 1925 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20423-0001. In addition, one copy of each pleading must be served on Robert Ledoux, Assistant General Counsel, CSX Transportation, Inc., 500 Water Street J-150, Jacksonville, FL 32202, and Louis E. Gitomer, Ball Janik LLP, 1455 F Street, NW., Suite 225, Washington, DC 20005.

Board decisions and notices are available on our Web site at <http://www.stb.dot.gov>.

Decided: September 29, 2005.

By the Board, David M. Konschnik, Director, Office of Proceedings.

**Vernon A. Williams,**  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 05-20019 Filed 10-6-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4915-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 34751]

#### Louisiana Southern Railroad, Inc.—Lease and Operation Exemption—The Kansas City Southern Railway Company

Louisiana Southern Railroad, Inc. (LSRR), a noncarrier,<sup>1</sup> has filed a verified notice of exemption under 49 CFR 1150.31 to lease from The Kansas City Southern Railway Company (KCS)

<sup>1</sup> LSRR is controlled by Watco Companies, Inc., a noncarrier that also controls thirteen (13) Class III railroads operating in thirteen States.