

## FTA REGIONAL OFFICES—Continued

<p>States served: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.</p> <p>Brigid Hynes-Cherin, Regional Administrator, Region 2—New York, One Bowling Green, Room 429, New York, NY 10004–1415, Tel. 212–668–2170.</p> <p>States served: New Jersey, New York.</p> <p>New York Metropolitan Office, Region 2—New York, One Bowling Green, Room 428, New York, NY 10004–1415, Tel. 212–668–2202.</p> <p>Letitia Thompson, Regional Administrator, Region 3—Philadelphia, 1760 Market Street, Suite 500, Philadelphia, PA 19103–4124, Tel. 215–656–7100.</p> <p>States served: Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, and District of Columbia.</p> <p>Philadelphia Metropolitan Office, Region 3—Philadelphia, 1760 Market Street, Suite 500, Philadelphia, PA 19103–4124, Tel. 215–656–7070.</p> <p>Washington, DC Metropolitan Office, 1990 K Street, NW., Room 510, Washington, DC 20006, Tel. 202–219–3562.</p> <p>Yvette Taylor, Regional Administrator, Region 4—Atlanta, 230 Peachtree Street, NW., Suite 800, Atlanta, GA 30303, Tel. 404–865–5600.</p> <p>States served: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virgin Islands.</p> <p>Marisol Simon, Regional Administrator, Region 5—Chicago, 200 West Adams Street, Suite 320, Chicago, IL 60606, Tel. 312–353–2789.</p> <p>States served: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin.</p> <p>Chicago Metropolitan Office, Region 5—Chicago, 200 West Adams Street, Suite 320, Chicago, IL 60606, Tel. 312–353–2789.</p>	<p>States served: Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, New Mexico and Texas.</p> <p>Mokhtee Ahmad, Regional Administrator, Region 7—Kansas City, MO, 901 Locust Street, Room 404, Kansas City, MO 64106, Tel. 816–329–3920.</p> <p>States served: Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska.</p> <p>Terry Rosapep, Regional Administrator, Region 8—Denver, 12300 West Dakota Ave., Suite 310, Lakewood, CO 80228–2583, Tel. 720–963–3300.</p> <p>States served: Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.</p> <p>Leslie T. Rogers, Regional Administrator, Region 9—San Francisco, 201 Mission Street, Room 1650, San Francisco, CA 94105–1926, Tel. 415–744–3133.</p> <p>States served: American Samoa, Arizona, California, Guam, Hawaii, Nevada, and the Northern Mariana Islands.</p> <p>Los Angeles Metropolitan Office, Region 9—Los Angeles, 888 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 1850, Los Angeles, CA 90017–1850, Tel. 213–202–3952.</p> <p>Rick Krochalis, Regional Administrator, Region 10—Seattle, Jackson Federal Building, 915 Second Avenue, Suite 3142, Seattle, WA 98174–1002, Tel. 206–220–7954.</p> <p>States served: Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.</p>
---	---

[FR Doc. 2010–703 Filed 1–14–10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**National Highway Traffic Safety Administration**

**Petition for Exemption From the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Chrysler**

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

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

**SUMMARY:** This document grants in full the Chrysler LLC, (Chrysler) petition for exemption of the Jeep Patriot vehicle line in accordance with 49 CFR Part 543, *Exemption from Vehicle 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 49 CFR Part 541, *Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard*.

**DATES:** The exemption granted by this notice is effective beginning with the 2011 Model Year (MY).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Carlita Ballard, International Policy, Fuel Economy and Consumer Programs, NHTSA, W43–439, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590. Ms. Ballard's phone number is (202) 366–0846. Her fax number is (202) 493–2990.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In a petition dated September 30, 2009, Chrysler requested an exemption from the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard (49 CFR Part 541) for the Jeep Patriot vehicle line, beginning with MY 2011. The petition requested an exemption from parts-marking requirements 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 Section § 543.5(a), a manufacturer may petition NHTSA to grant exemptions for one of its vehicle lines per year. Chrysler petitioned the agency to grant an exemption for its Jeep Patriot vehicle line beginning with MY 2011. In its petition, Chrysler provided a detailed description and diagram of the identity, design, and location of the

components of the antitheft device for the new vehicle line. Chrysler will install the Sentry Key Immobilizer System (SKIS) antitheft device as standard equipment on the vehicle line. The major components of the SKIS device consist of: a Powertrain Control Module, an Integrated Power Module, a Sentry Key Remote Entry Module (SKREEM), a fob with integrated key (FOBIK) and an Electromechanical Instrument Cluster which controls the telltale function only. According to Chrysler, all of these components work collectively to perform the immobilizer function, and the SKIS device does not provide a visible or audible indication of unauthorized vehicle entry (*i.e.*, flashing lights or horn alarm).

Chrysler stated that the SKIS provides passive vehicle protection by preventing the engine from operating unless a valid electronically encoded key is detected in the ignition lock cylinder. According to Chrysler, the immobilizer feature is activated when the key is removed from the ignition lock cylinder. Only a valid key inserted into the ignition lock cylinder will allow the vehicle to start and continue to run.

Chrysler stated that the SKREEM/Wireless Ignition Node (WIN), an integral component of the SKIS antitheft device, contains a radio frequency

transceiver and microprocessor that receives signals from the Sentry key transponder and communicates to the FOBIK. According to Chrysler, the SKREEM/WIN determines whether a valid key is present in the ignition switch based on the signal received from the transponder, and also serves as the receiver for the Tire Pressure Monitoring System if the vehicle is equipped with one. To avoid any perceived delay when starting the vehicle with a valid key and to prevent unburned fuel from entering the exhaust, Chrysler stated that the engine is permitted to run for no more than 2 seconds if an invalid key is used. If the response identifies the key as invalid, or if no response is received from the key transponder, Chrysler stated that the SKREEM sends an invalid key message to the Powertrain Control Module (PCM), and the PCM will disable engine operation (after the initial 2-second run) based upon the status of the SKREEM messages. Chrysler stated that only six consecutive invalid vehicle start attempts would be permitted and all other attempts would be locked out by preventing the fuel injectors from firing and disabling the starter.

Chrysler stated that it has incorporated an unauthorized vehicle start telltale light into the device. Chrysler stated that the telltale feature operates as a security indicator in the Electro Mechanical Instrument Cluster (EMIC). According to Chrysler, the telltale alerts the owner that an unauthorized vehicle start attempt has been made. Chrysler stated that upon an unauthorized start attempt, the telltale will flash on and off when the ignition switch is turned to the "ON" position. Chrysler stated that besides acting as a security indicator, the telltale acts as a diagnostic indicator. Chrysler stated that if the SKREEM detects a system malfunction and/or the SKIS has become inoperative, the security indicator will stay on. If the SKREEM detects an invalid key or if a key transponder-related fault exists, the security indicator will flash.

Chrysler stated that each ignition key used in the SKIS has an integral transponder chip included on the circuit board beneath the cover of the integral Remote Keyless Entry (RKE) transmitter. Chrysler stated that in addition to having to be cut to match the mechanical coding of the ignition lock cylinder and programmed for operation of the RKE system, each new Sentry Key has a unique transponder identification code that is permanently programmed into it by the manufacturer, and which must be programmed into the SKREEM to be recognized by the SKIS as a valid

key. Chrysler stated that once a Sentry Key has been programmed to a particular vehicle, it cannot be used on any other vehicle.

In addressing the specific content requirements of 543.6, Chrysler provided information on the reliability and durability of the device. Chrysler conducted tests based on its own specified standards and stated its belief that the device meets the stringent performance standards prescribed. Specifically, Chrysler stated that its device must demonstrate a minimum of 95 percent reliability with 90 percent confidence. In addition to the design and production validation test criteria, Chrysler stated that the SKIS also undergoes a daily short term durability test. Chrysler also stated that 100 percent of its systems undergo a series of three functional tests for durability prior to being shipped from the supplier to the vehicle assembly plant for installation in its vehicles.

Chrysler stated that while there is no theft data available for the Jeep Patriot because it's a new vehicle line introduction, experience with the Jeep Liberty, a similar 5-door, All Wheel Drive, crossover/Sport Utility Vehicle as the Jeep Patriot indicates that this vehicle is projected to have a theft rate lower than the median theft rate. Chrysler offered the Jeep Grand Cherokee as an example vehicle with a SKIS immobilizer system as standard equipment since the 1999 model year. The average theft rate for the Jeep Grand Cherokee vehicles for the four model years prior to 1999 (1995–1998), when a vehicle immobilizer system was not offered as standard equipment, was 5.3574 per one thousand vehicles produced, which is significantly higher than the 1990/1991 median theft rate of 3.5826. However, the average theft rate for the six model years (1999–2005) after installation of the standard immobilizer device was 2.5492, which is significantly lower than the median. The Jeep Grand Cherokee vehicle line was granted an exemption from the parts-marking requirements beginning with MY 2004. Chrysler further stated that NHTSA's theft data for the Jeep Grand Cherokee indicates that the inclusion of a standard immobilizer system has resulted in a 52.3 percent net average reduction in vehicle thefts.

Based on the supporting evidence submitted by Chrysler on the Jeep Grand Cherokee, the agency believes that the antitheft device for the Jeep Patriot 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.

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 33106 and 49 CFR 543.7(b), the agency grants a petition for exemption from the parts-marking requirements of Part 541, either in whole or in part, if it determines that, based upon supporting 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 Chrysler has provided adequate reasons for its belief that the antitheft device for the Chrysler Jeep Patriot 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 Part 541). This conclusion is based on the information Chrysler provided about its device.

For the foregoing reasons, the agency hereby grants in full Chrysler's petition for an exemption for the MY 2011 Jeep Patriot 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 with respect 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 Chrysler decides not to use the exemption for this vehicle line, it must formally notify the agency. If such a decision is made, the vehicle 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 Chrysler 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: January 11, 2010.

**Stephen R. Kratzke,**

*Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.*

[FR Doc. 2010-732 Filed 1-14-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Railroad Administration

#### Petition for Waiver of Compliance

In accordance with part 211 of Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), notice is hereby given that the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) received a request for a waiver of compliance with certain requirements of its safety standards. The individual petition is described below, including the party seeking relief, the regulatory provisions involved, the nature of the relief being requested, and the petitioner's arguments in favor of relief from the requirements of 49 CFR Part 236 as detailed below.

#### CSX Transportation, Inc.

[Docket Number FRA-2009-0120]

The CSX Transportation, Inc. (CSXT) seeks relief from the requirements of the Rules, Standards and Instructions, Title 49 CFR Part 236, Section 236.377 Approach Locking; 236.378 Time Locking; 236.379 Route Locking; 236.380 Indication Locking; and 236.381 Traffic Locking on vital microprocessor-based systems. CSXT proposes to verify and test signal locking systems controlled by microprocessor-based equipment by use of alternative procedures every 4 years

after initial baseline testing or program change as follows:

- Verifying the Cyclic Redundancy Check (CRC)/Check Sum/Universal Control Number (UNC) of the existing location's specific application logic to the previously tested version.
- Testing the appropriate interconnection to the associated signaling hardware equipment outside of the processor (switch indication, track indication, searchlight signal indication, approach locking (if external)) to verify correct and intended inputs to and outputs from the processor are maintained.

- Analyze and compare the results of the 4-year alternative testing with the results of the baseline testing performed at the location and submit the results to FRA.

*Applicant's justification for relief:* Many of CSXT's interlockings, control points, and other locations are controlled by solid-state vital microprocessor-based systems. These systems utilize programmed logic equations in lieu of relays or other mechanical components for control of both vital and non-vital functions. The logic does not change once a microprocessor-based system has been tested and locking tests are documented on installation.

Interested parties are invited to participate in these proceedings by submitting written views, data, or comments. FRA does not anticipate scheduling a public hearing in connection with these proceedings since the facts do not appear to warrant a hearing. If any interested party desires an opportunity for oral comment, they should notify FRA, in writing, before the end of the comment period and specify the basis for their request.

All communications concerning these proceedings should identify the appropriate docket number (e.g., Waiver Petition Docket Number FRA-2009-0120) and may be submitted by any of the following methods:

- *Web site:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.
- *Fax:* 202-493-2251.
- *Mail:* Docket Operations Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., W12-140, Washington, DC 20590.
- *Hand Delivery:* 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Room W12-140, Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Communications received within 45 days of the date of this notice will be considered by FRA before final action is taken. Comments received after that

date will be considered as far as practicable. All written communications concerning these proceedings are available for examination during regular business hours (9 a.m.-5 p.m.) at the above facility. All documents in the public docket are also available for inspection and copying on the Internet at the docket facility's Web site at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

Anyone is able to search the electronic form of any written communications and comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the document (or signing the document, 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 (65 FR 19477) or at <http://www.dot.gov/privacy.html>.

Issued in Washington, DC on January 11, 2010.

**Grady C. Cothen, Jr.,**

*Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Standards and Program Development.*

[FR Doc. 2010-682 Filed 1-14-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-06-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Maritime Administration

[Docket No. MARAD-2009-0002]

#### Requested Administrative Waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws

**AGENCY:** Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

**ACTION:** Invitation for public comments on a requested administrative waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws for the vessel BOO PACIFIC.

**SUMMARY:** As authorized by 46 U.S.C. 12121, the Secretary of Transportation, as represented by the Maritime Administration (MARAD), is authorized to grant waivers of the U.S.-build requirement of the coastwise laws under certain circumstances. A request for such a waiver has been received by MARAD. The vessel, and a brief description of the proposed service, is listed below. The complete application is given in DOT docket MARAD-2009-0002 at <http://www.regulations.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 46 U.S.C. 12121 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