

indicates the components are unauthorized, further operation and use of the vehicle is restricted or even impossible.

In order to ensure the reliability and durability of the device, Porsche conducted tests based on its own specified standards. Porsche provided a detailed list of tests conducted and believes that its device is reliable and durable since the device complied with its specified requirements for each test. The test conducted included extreme temperature tests, voltage spike tests, reverse polarity tests, electromagnetic interference tests, vibration tests and endurance tests. Porsche stated that its antitheft device also features a built-in self-diagnostic that constantly checks for system failures. If a failure is detected, the operator receives a signal via an alarm indicator.

In its MY 2013 modification, Porsche stated that it believes its new Boxster antitheft device will prove to be even more effective in reducing and deterring theft than its antitheft devices have proven in the past. Porsche also compared its device with other devices without alarms that NHTSA has determined to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft. Porsche stated that similar systems without alarms, i.e., GM PASS-Key, Mercedes Benz 202 vehicle line, Porsche Boxster (Cayman) as well as earlier 911 vehicle line devices, were determined to be as effective as parts-marking. Porsche also referenced the agency's theft rate data for the Boxster vehicle line which indicates that its theft rates (MY/CY 2002–2009) are still below the median theft rate of 3.5826. The average theft rates for the Boxster vehicle line (Boxster convertible and Cayman coupe) using the most current 3 MY's theft rate data are 0.3789 and 0.7217, respectively.

The agency has evaluated Porsche's MY 2013 petition to modify the exemption for the Boxster vehicle line from the parts-marking requirements of 49 CFR part 541, and has decided to grant it. The agency believes that the proposed device will continue to provide the five types of performance listed in § 543.6(a)(3): (1) Promoting activation, (2) attracting attention to the efforts of unauthorized persons to enter or operate a vehicle by means other than a key, (3) preventing defeat or circumvention of the device by unauthorized persons, (4) preventing operation of the vehicle by unauthorized entrants and (5) ensuring the reliability and durability of the device.

If Porsche 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 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: April 10, 2012.

Christopher J. Bonanti,

Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 2012–8892 Filed 4–12–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2012–0041; Notice 1]

Hyundai Motor Company, Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Receipt of petition.

SUMMARY: Hyundai America Technical Center, Inc., on behalf of Hyundai Motor Company (collectively referred to as “Hyundai”) ¹ has determined that certain model year 2011 and 2012 Hyundai Sonata Hybrid passenger cars, do not fully comply with paragraph S4.1.5.5.2 of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 208, *Occupant Crash Protection*. Hyundai has filed an appropriate report dated March 8, 2012, pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports*.

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) (see implementing rule at 49 CFR part 556), Hyundai submitted a petition for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

This notice of receipt of Hyundai's petition is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the petition.

Vehicles involved: Affected are approximately 14,728 model year 2011

¹ Hyundai America Technical Center, Inc., is a corporation registered under the laws of the state of Michigan.

and 2012 Hyundai Sonata Hybrid vehicles produced beginning on December 2, 2010 and shipped to dealers through March 7, 2012 that are equipped with a center rear seat belt incorporating a release mechanism that detaches both the lap and shoulder portion at the lower anchorage point.

NHTSA notes that the statutory provisions (49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h)) that permit manufacturers to file petitions for a determination of inconsequentiality allow NHTSA to exempt manufacturers only from the duties found in sections 30118 and 30120, respectively, to notify owners, purchasers, and dealers of a defect or noncompliance and to remedy the defect or noncompliance. Therefore, these provisions only apply to the subject 14,728² vehicles that Hyundai no longer controlled at the time it determined that the noncompliance existed.

Noncompliance: Hyundai explains that the noncompliance is that the affected vehicles do not comply with Paragraph S4.1.5.5.2 because they are equipped with a non-folding rear seat back and a center rear seat belt incorporating a release mechanism that detaches both the lap and shoulder portion at the lower anchorage point to allow improved assembly line procedures.

Rule text: Paragraph S4.1.5.5 of FMVSS No. 208 requires in pertinent part:

S4.1.5.5 Passenger cars manufactured on or after September 1, 2007.

S4.1.5.5.1 Except as provided in S4.1.5.5.2, each passenger car shall have a Type 2 seat belt assembly that conforms to Standard No. 209 and to S7.1 and S7.2 of this standard at each rear designated seating position, except that side-facing designated seating positions shall have a Type 1 or Type 2 seat belt assembly that conforms to Standard No. 209 and to S7.1 and S7.2 of this standard.

S4.1.5.5.2 Any inboard designated seating position on a seat for which the entire seat back can be folded (including the head restraints and any other part of the vehicle attached to the seat back) such that no part of the seat back extends above a horizontal plane located 250 mm above the highest SRP located on the seat may meet the requirements of S4.1.5.5.1 by use of a belt incorporating a release mechanism that

² Hyundai's petition, which was filed under 49 CFR part 556, requests an agency decision to exempt Hyundai as a motor vehicles manufacturer from the notification and recall responsibilities of 49 CFR part 573 for the 14,728 affected vehicles. However, a decision on this petition will not relieve vehicle distributors and dealers of the prohibitions on the sale, offer for sale, introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of the noncompliant motor vehicles under their control after Hyundai notified them that the subject noncompliance existed.

detaches both the lap and shoulder portion at either the upper or lower anchorage point, but not both. The means of detachment shall be a key or key-like object.

Summary of Hyundai's Analysis and Arguments

Hyundai believes that the installation of a center rear seat belt incorporating a release mechanism that detaches both the lap and shoulder portion at the lower anchorage point in a vehicle with a nonfolding rear seat back is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety. The seat belt assembly complies with FMVSS No. 208 requirements and with FMVSS No. 209 requirements, with the sole exception that it may be detached from the lower anchorage by use of a tool, such as a key or key-like object. If the rear seat back of the Sonata Hybrid vehicle was simply capable of being folded, which would have no effect upon seat belt performance, this detachable aspect would not result in a compliance issue.

Hyundai also stated its belief that it is clear from the intended difficulty in detaching the seat belt and the instructions contained in the vehicle owner's manual that the seat belt should not be detached. Further, in the Sonata Hybrid with a fixed rear seat back, there is no advantage or reason for the owner to detach the center rear seat belt from the lower anchorage.

Hyundai has additionally informed NHTSA that it has corrected the noncompliance so that all future production vehicles will comply with FMVSS No. 208.

With consideration of the above information, Hyundai Motor Company does not believe that it is appropriate to conduct a recall campaign to replace the center rear seat belts in vehicles that have been delivered to customers.

In summation, Hyundai believes that the described noncompliance of its vehicles is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that its petition, to exempt from providing recall notification of noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30118 and remedying the recall noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30120 should be granted.

Comments: Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on this petition. Comments must refer to the docket and notice number cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted by any of the following methods:

a. By mail addressed to: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200

New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590.

b. By hand delivery to U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. except Federal Holidays.

c. Electronically: by logging onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Web site at <http://www.regulations.gov/>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Comments may also be faxed to 1-202-493-2251.

Comments must be written in the English language, and be no greater than 15 pages in length, although there is no limit to the length of necessary attachments to the comments. If comments are submitted in hard copy form, please ensure that two copies are provided. If you wish to receive confirmation that your comments were received, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard with the comments. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided.

Documents submitted to a docket may be viewed by anyone at the address and times given above. The documents may also be viewed on the Internet at http://www.regulations.gov by following the online instructions for accessing the dockets. DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement is available for review in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000, (65 FR 19477-78).

The petition, supporting materials, and all comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated below will be filed and will be considered. All comments and supporting materials received after the closing date will also be filed and will be considered to the extent possible. When the petition is granted or denied, notice of the decision will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

Comment Closing Date: May 14, 2012.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; delegations of authority at CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on: April 9, 2012.

Claude H. Harris,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2012-8895 Filed 4-12-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

[Docket No. PHMSA-2012-0024]

Pipeline Safety: Information Collection Activities, Revision to Gas Transmission and Gathering Pipeline Systems Annual Report, Gas Transmission and Gathering Pipeline Systems Incident Report, and Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Systems Accident Report

AGENCY: Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: PHMSA is preparing to request approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for the revision of several forms in two currently approved information collections. PHMSA is looking at making several minor revisions to the hazardous liquid pipeline systems accident report and the gas transmission and gathering pipeline systems incident report. In addition, PHMSA is considering a number of revisions to the annual report form for gas transmission and gathering pipeline systems. In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, PHMSA invites comments only on the proposed revisions to the forms.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before June 12, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted in the following ways:

E-Gov Web Site: http://www.regulations.gov. This site allows the public to enter comments on any **Federal Register** notice issued by any agency.

Fax: 1-202-493-2251.

Mail: Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., West Building, Room W12-140, Washington, DC 20590-0001.

Hand Delivery: Room W12-140 on the ground level of DOT, West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Instructions: Identify the docket number, PHMSA-2012-0024, at the beginning of your comments. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided. You