meet. The present document confirms the effective date of that direct final

EFFECTIVE DATES: The direct final rule published May 17, 2004 (69 FR 27861), goes into effect October 8, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: L.M. Furrow by phone at 202–366–4559, by fax at 202–366–4566, by mail at U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590, or by e-mail at buck.furrow@rspa.dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 17, 2004, RSPA/OPS published a direct final rule titled "Pipeline Safety: Pressure Limiting and Regulating Stations" (69 FR 27861). In the direct final rule, RSPA/OPS stated that if it did not receive an adverse comment, as defined in 49 CFR 190.339(c),¹ or notice of intent to file an adverse comment by July 16, 2004, it would publish a confirmation document to announce that the direct final rule would go into effect on September 14, 2004, or at least 30 days after the confirmation document is published, whichever is later.

As of July 16, 2004, only one person, Barb Sachau, submitted a comment on the direct final rule. Ms. Sachau exhorted RSPA/OPS to ensure pipelines are truly safe by adopting additional standards and hiring experts. Because Ms. Sachau addressed pipeline safety in general and did not speak specifically about the direct final rule, we do not consider her comment to be an adverse comment under 49 CFR 190.339(c). Therefore, by this document, we are confirming that the direct final rule will go into effect on October 8, 2004.

Issued in Washington, DC, on August 30, 2004.

Stacey L. Gerard,

Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety. [FR Doc. 04–20262 Filed 9–7–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. 00-7145; Notice 3]

RIN No. 2127-AH61

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Head Impact Protection; Correction

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Correcting amendment.

SUMMARY: On February 27, 2004, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) published a final rule amending the upper interior impact requirements of the Federal motor vehicle safety standard on occupant protection in interior impact to increase the minimum separation distance between tested areas on vertical surfaces of a motor vehicle. The final rule also added targets for pillarlike structures that do not meet the definition of "pillar," i.e., certain door frames and freestanding vertical seat belt mounting structures. The amendments adding the new targets necessitated changes to certain compliance test requirements, including the approach angles specified for certain target locations. The effective date of these amendments was August 25, 2004.

This document corrects several typographical errors in the amendatory language contained in the February 27, 2004 final rule.

DATES: These amendments are effective August 25, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The following persons at the NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590.

For non-legal issues, you may call Dr. William Fan, Office of Crashworthiness Standards, at (202) 366–4922.

For legal issues, you may call George Feygin, Office of the Chief Counsel, at (202) 366–5834.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On February 27, 2004, NHTSA published a final rule (69 FR 9226) amending Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard

201 "Occupant protection in interior impact." The amendments made two principal changes to the Standard. One of these changed the method used to determine the appropriate distance for excluding impacts on adjacent targets to prevent impact overlap. The second modified the Standard to add test targets to seat belt mounting structures and door frames for certain vehicle configurations. The addition of the new targets required adding new specifications for the new targets to the list of approach angles set forth in S8.13.4.

Further review of the February 27, 2004 final rule indicates that the amendatory instructions issued at that time were incomplete and did not properly describe the changes to the Standard. Those instructions failed to correctly specify that revisions were being made to S8.13.4 and the accompanying Table 1. In addition, the amendatory language failed to identify that revisions were being made to S8.13.4.2(b)(2) by indicating that revisions were being made to S8.13.4.2(b).

In FR Doc. 04–4277 published on February 27, 2004, (69 FR 9217) make the following correction:

PART 571—[CORRECTED]

- On page 9226, in the second column, correct amendatory instruction 2 to read as follows:
- 2. Section 571.201 is amended by revising the definition of B-pillar in S3 and adding, in alphabetical order, definitions of B-pillar, Door frame, Other door frame, and Seat belt mounting structure to S3; by adding S6.3(e) and SB.13.4.1(e) through (h); revising the introductory text and Table 1 of S8.13.4, S8.13.4.2(b)(2), S8.14, and S10(a) through (b); and by adding S10.14, S10.15 and S10.16 to read as follows:

Issued: August 31, 2004.

Stephen R. Kratzke,

Associate Administrator for Rulemaking. [FR Doc. 04–20261 Filed 9–7–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

¹An adverse comment is one which explains why the rule would be inappropriate, including a challenge to the rule's underlying premise or approach, or would be ineffective or unacceptable without a change. Comments that are frivolous or insubstantial will not be considered adverse under this procedure. A comment recommending a rule change in addition to the rule will not be considered an adverse comment, unless the commenter states why the rule would be ineffective without the additional change.