in an ''H'' configuration, but displays the gear positions in a row.

The petition states that the consequences of motorist in manual transmission-equipped vehicles committing shifting errors while stopped at pedestrian crosswalks and railroad crossings may be fatal. It also states that multiple vehicle operators encounter various shifting patterns, and the petition claims they are at risk of causing property damage and injuries without shift pattern illumination and shift lever position identification. The petition also claims that shift pattern illumination and the identification of shift lever position are more important on vehicles equipped with idle-stop technology where the engine stops and starts automatically while the vehicle is stationary. The agency has searched both its crash and complaint databases and has found no indication of a shifting error problem relative to manual transmission-equipped vehicles both with and without the idle-stop feature. Drivers of manual transmission-equipped vehicles shift and know what gear they are in by feel. Once drivers learn their shift patterns, (a process that is completed very quickly), there is no need for them to look at the shift pattern each time they shift or want to know their gear position.

In accordance with 49 CFR part 552, this completes the agency's technical review of the petition for rulemaking from TVK Industries, Inc. NHTSA believes that Mr. Kazyaka's interpretations relative to FMVSS Nos. 101 and 102 are incorrect and the standards do not require manual transmission shift patterns to be illuminated or to indicate the shift lever position. Also, NHTSA believes that any suggested amendments to the FMVSSs that would require manual transmission shift lever patterns to be illuminated or indicate the shift lever position would not change the performance requirements in a manner that would result in improved safety. Thus, after considering the allocation of agency resources and agency priorities, NHTSA has decided that the rulemaking requested by the petitioner is not warranted. Accordingly, the rulemaking requested by the petition is denied.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 322, 30111, 30115, 30166 and 30177; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.

Issued on: March 2, 2005.

Stephen R. Kratzke,

Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 05–4433 Filed 3–7–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. NHTSA 2005–20028]

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.

ACTION: Denial of Petition for Rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document denies a petition for rulemaking submitted by Mr. Richard T. Ince of C & J Technology Inc., to amend provisions of the Federal motor vehicle safety standard (FMVSS) for rearview mirrors pertaining to the test procedure for school bus driving mirrors.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For technical issues: Mr. Charles R. Hott, Office of Crashworthiness Standards, NVS–113, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone (202) 366–0247. Fax: (202) 366–7002.

For legal issues: Eric Stas, Office of Chief Counsel, NCC–112, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: (202) 366–2992 and fax: (202) 366–3820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 2, 2004, the agency received a petition from Mr. Richard T. Ince, C & J Technology Inc., requesting that the agency review and amend paragraph S13.3(g) of FMVSS No. 111, ''Rearview Mirrors,'' which provides procedures for the placement of ''cones'' ''P'' and ''L'' in the school bus mirror test procedure for the driving mirrors. The petitioner stated that the change is needed ''because the rule as stated provides unnecessary and dangerous blind spots in the operator's field of indirect vision along the sides of the school bus.''

The petitioner stated that S9.1 of the standard requires that exterior driving mirrors be tested using cones placed in accordance with the requirements specified in S13. S13 requires the placement of 18 cylinders [1] of a specified height and size at various locations around the school bus. He said cylinder P on the passenger side of the vehicle is placed at 3.6 meters (12 feet) to the right of the longitudinal vertical plane tangent at the center of the rear axle. He said that cylinder L on the driver side, is placed at 1.8 meters (6 feet) to the left of the longitudinal vertical plane tangent at the center of the rear axle. The petitioner asserted that meeting such requirements ''builds into the vehicle blind spots along the sides of the vehicle that are unnecessary and dangerous,'' and he illustrated this with an Exhibit B (Figure 1). C & J Technology claims that these blind spots put the operator and any children along the sides of the vehicle in a dangerous position as the bus leaves a stop, because the driver cannot see the blind spot areas in the rearview mirror system. The petitioner claims that in such situations the driver would be forced to physically look at these areas before moving the bus forward; however, if the driver does not, it could be especially dangerous to children in these blind spots.

C & J Technology's recommended solution is to amend the standard so that cylinders L and P are moved out from the center of the rear axle to a point that would reduce or eliminate the alleged blind spot problem. The petitioner stated that with the use of the ''BDS Dead Angle Spot Mirror,'' the field of vision could increase to a level up to 65 percent greater than that provided by the standard's current requirements. The petitioner further stated that the ''BDS Dead Angle Spot Mirror'' is a wide angle glass, and it is cut in such a manner as to make it possible to move the cylinders out to approximately 21.4 meters (70 feet) from the center of the rear axle, thereby making ''the entire side of the bus visible with just a glance in the mirror by the operator.''

Analysis of the Petitioner's Argument

The statement provided by C & J Technology, which asserts that the test procedure requirements in the standard builds into the vehicle dangerous blind spots, is inaccurate. Currently, all school buses are required to have two mirror systems, System A mirrors that are typically called ''driving mirrors,'' and System B mirrors which are pedestrian detection mirrors. The System A mirrors are used by the operator to maneuver the school bus safely in traffic. The System B mirrors are pedestrian detection mirrors that are

[1] It is noted that the petitioner incorrectly implies that the regulation uses ''cones'' to measure compliance with the standard. The standard uses cylinders that are 0.3048 meters (1 foot) high and 0.0348 meters (1 foot) in diameter. The standard uses cylinders (not cones) because, as stated in the December 2, 1992 final rule, the agency believes 0.3048 meter (1 foot) cylinders more accurately represent a child that is bending over or has fallen down. (57 FR 57000)

used by the operator while loading and unloading passengers. The requirements for two mirror systems were established to ensure that the school bus driver has the requisite field of vision for both pedestrian detection and navigation of the roadway. The standard requires that the driver have a direct or indirect field-of-view immediately in front of the bus and along both sides of the school bus in order to ensure that there are no blind spots. Figure 2 presents a graphic with the minimum viewing areas required by the standard. The petition asserts that the System A driving mirrors may not serve as adequate pedestrian detection mirrors. Even accepting this as true, the driving mirrors are not intended to serve as pedestrian detection mirrors.

Decision To Deny the Petition

In accordance with 49 CFR part 552, this completes the agency's review of the petition for rulemaking. For the reasons stated above, the petition for rulemaking is denied.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 322, 3011, 30115, 30117, and, 30162; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P



Figure 1. Ince Exhibit B.



Figure 2, Minimum viewing area, School Bus System A and B Field-Of-View

Issued on: March 2, 2005.

Stephen R. Kratzke,

Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 05–4434 Filed 3–7–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–C

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 572

[Docket No. NHTSA–2004–18865]

RIN 2127–AJ16

Anthropomorphic Test Devices; SID-IIsFRG Side Impact Crash Test Dummy

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

ACTION: Extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: On December 8, 2004, NHTSA published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) in the **Federal Register** that proposed to amend 49 CFR part 572 to add specifications and qualification requirements for a 5th percentile adult female test dummy for use in vehicle side impact tests. In that NPRM, NHTSA established a March 8, 2005, deadline for submission of written comments. NHTSA has received a request from the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers to extend the comment period ''to facilitate a comprehensive technical evaluation of that test device and allow manufacturers the opportunity to perform necessary fleet testing with the proposed test device.'' In response to that request, NHTSA is extending the comment period to April 12, 2005.

DATES: Comments must be received by April 12, 2005. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent possible.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments (identified by the DOT DMS Docket Number) by any of the following methods:

Web Site: http://dms.dot.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments on the DOT electronic docket site.

Fax: 1–202–493–2251.

Mail: Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL–401, Washington, DC 20590–0001.

Hand Delivery: Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to *http://www.regulations.gov*. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

Instructions: All submissions must include the agency name and docket number or Regulatory Identification Number (RIN) for the rulemaking to which you are commenting. For detailed instructions on submitting comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the Public Participation heading of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to *http://dms.dot.gov*, including any personal information provided. Please see the Privacy Act discussion under the Public Participation heading.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to *http://dms.dot.gov* at any time or to Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stan Backaitis, NHTSA Office of Crashworthiness Standards (202) 366–4912, or Deirdre Fujita, NHTSA Office of Chief Counsel (telephone (202) 366–2992). Both of these officials may be reached at 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On December 8, 2004 (69 FR 70947; Docket No. 18865), the agency published an NPRM proposing to add specifications and qualification requirements for a 5th percentile adult female side impact crash test dummy to NHTSA's regulation on anthropomorphic test devices (49 CFR part 572). The test dummy, called the SID–IIsFRG, was part of an NPRM that NHTSA published in May 2004 that proposed to upgrade FMVSS No. 214, ''Side Impact Protection.'' The NPRM on FMVSS No. 214 proposed to require that all passenger vehicles with a gross vehicle weight rating of up to 4,536 kilograms (10,000 pounds) protect front seat occupants against head, thoracic, abdominal and pelvic injuries in a vehicle-to-pole test simulating a vehicle crashing sideways into narrow fixed objects like telephone poles and trees (69 FR 27990, May 17, 2004; Docket 2004–17694). The NPRM proposed that compliance with the pole test would be determined in tests using the SID–IIsFRG, and in tests using a new test dummy representing mid-size adult males (the ''ES–2re'' crash test dummy).

The comment period for the NPRM on the SID–IIsFRG closes March 8, 2005. The Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers has petitioned to extend the comment period ''until mid 2005 to facilitate a comprehensive technical evaluation of that test device and allow manufacturers the opportunity to perform necessary fleet testing with the proposed test device. Further, the requested extension aligns the comment closing date with that requested by the Alliance in its October 14, 2004 petition.'' That October 14, 2004, petition of the Alliance was to extend, for eight months, the comment periods for the FMVSS No. 214 NPRM and for an NPRM on specifications for the ES–2re (which was published September 15, 2004; 69 FR 55550; Docket No. 18864). On January 12, 2005, in response to the petition, NHTSA reopened the comment period for those NPRMs for 90 days (70 FR 2105; Docket No. 17694, 18864). The 90-day period closes April 12, 2005.

We are extending the comment period for the SID–IIsFRG NPRM from March 8, 2005, to April 12, 2005, to align the comment closing date with those of the related NPRMs on FMVSS No. 214 and the ES–2re test dummy. The extended comment period gives interested parties additional time to submit comments without unnecessarily delaying key decisions by NHTSA about the FMVSS No. 214 rulemaking and without overly delaying the potential societal benefits associated with a final rule.

Public Participation

How Do I Prepare and Submit Comments?

Your comments must be written and in English. To ensure that your comments are correctly filed in the Docket, please include the appropriate docket number in your comments.

Your comments must not be more than 15 pages long. (49 CFR 553.21). NHTSA established this limit to encourage you to write your primary comments in a concise fashion. However, you may attach necessary additional documents to your comments. There is no limit on the length of the attachments.

Please submit two copies of your comments, including the attachments, to Docket Management at the address given above under **ADDRESSES**.

You may also submit your comments to the docket electronically by logging onto the Dockets Management System Web site at *http://dms.dot.gov*. Click on ''Help & Information'' or ''Help/Info'' to obtain instructions for filing the document electronically.