

The FAA invites your comments on this proposed policy. We will accept your comments, data, views, or arguments by letter, fax, or e-mail. Send your comments to the person indicated in **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. Mark your comments, "Comments to Policy Statement No. ANM-03-115-31."

Use the following format when preparing your comments:

- Organize your comments issue-by-issue.
- For each issue, state what specific change you are requesting to the proposed policy.
- Include justification, reasons, or data for each change you are requesting.

We also welcome comments in support of the proposed policy.

We will consider all communications received on or before the closing date for comments. We may change the proposed policy because of the comments received.

### Background

The policy memorandum provides FAA certification policy on conducting compliance level tests in order to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of § 25.785(b) and (d). The tests described herein provide a standardized approach by which each potentially injurious item located within the headstrike zone can be assessed for occupant injury potential. These test methods are the product of an Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee recommendation and are harmonized with the Joint Aviation Authorities (JAA) and Transport Canada.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on July 7, 2003.

**Ali Bahrami,**

*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 03-18517 Filed 7-21-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

[Policy Statement No. ANM-03-115-05]

### No Smoking Placards and Signs

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of final policy.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) announces the availability of final policy on no-smoking placards.

**DATES:** This final policy was issued by the Transport Airplane Directorate on July 7, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michael T. Thompson, Federal Aviation Administration, Transport Airplane Directorate, Transport Standards Staff, Airframe and Cabin Safety Branch, ANM-115, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, WA 98055-4056; telephone (425) 227-1157; fax (425) 227-1149; e-mail: [michael.t.thompson@faa.gov](mailto:michael.t.thompson@faa.gov).

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Discussion of Comments

A notice of proposed policy as published in the **Federal Register** on March 17, 2003 (68 FR 12735). No comments were received.

### Background

The policy further simplifies the certification process pertaining to the requirement for no-smoking placards legible to each occupant seated in compartments where smoking is prohibited. The FAA has determined that a lighted sign can be considered a placard if it is continuously illuminated for the occupants. These signs should illuminate without the cockpit or cabin crew having to turn the signs on, which the airplane's normal electrical power is on or by providing equivalent control of the signs by software. The policy allows the signs to not be operable by the crew by documenting an equivalent safety finding.

The final policy is available on the Internet at the following address: <http://www.airweb.faa.gov/rgl>. If you do not have access to the Internet, you can obtain a copy of the policy by contacting the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on July 7, 2003.

**Ali Bahrami,**

*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 03-18519 Filed 7-21-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-03-15687; Notice 1]

### Ford Motor Company; Receipt of Application for Temporary Exemption From Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 103

We are asking for comments on the application by Ford Motor Company ("Ford") of Dearborn, Michigan, for a

temporary exemption from Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 103, Defrosting and Defogging Systems. Ford asserted that compliance would prevent it from selling a motor vehicle whose overall level of safety is at least equal to that of a non-exempted vehicle.

We are publishing this notice of receipt of the application in accordance with our regulations on the subject. This action does not mean that we have made a judgment yet about the merits of the application.

### The Motor Vehicle for Which a Temporary Exemption Is Sought

Ford is the manufacturer of the Lincoln Town Car. This motor vehicle is planned to be made available in a "Ballistic Protection Series (BPS)." It will be equipped with a windshield that is 40.68 mm thick, as contrasted with the standard Town Car's windshield of 4.9 mm thickness. The company related that "this thickness and the associated heat transfer properties are engineered to provide protection from impacts by certain rifle rounds \* \* \* Ford does not envision producing more than 300 Town Car BPS Series in any calendar year.

### How the Town Car BPS Fails To Comply With FMVSS No. 103

Paragraph S4.2 of FMVSS No. 103 establishes defrosting requirements for passenger car windshields. Ford related that "At this time clearance of the windshield in the time required under FMVSS 103 S4.2 can only be met with the usage of the washer fluid."

### Arguments Presented by Ford Demonstrating That the Town Car BPS Provides an Overall Level of Safety at Least Equal to a Non-Exempted Motor Vehicle

To maximize the defroster performance, the special windshield of the BPS is equipped with an embedded electrical grid. Ford's laboratory tests show that the windshield can, in fact, be cleared within the time required by S4.2 "by using both the defroster (including the hot air system and the embedded electrical grid in the windshield) and the windshield washer system." The information provided with the vehicle will advise the vehicle operator to use the combined approach in defrosting the windshield. However, Ford anticipates that these special purpose vehicles are more likely to be garaged than parked in the open, and that the need to operate the defroster system will be minimal.