

procedures for renewing exemptions from the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). Specifically, Advocates objects to the agency's extension of the exemptions without any opportunity for public comment prior to the decision to renew, and reliance on a summary statement of evidence to make its decision to extend the exemption of each driver.

The issues raised by Advocates were addressed at length in 69 FR 51346 (August 18, 2004). The FMCSA continues to find its exemption process appropriate to the statutory and regulatory requirements.

Issued on: August 19, 2004.

**Rose A. McMurray,**

*Associate Administrator, Policy and Program Development.*

[FR Doc. 04-19567 Filed 8-26-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-EX-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Transit Administration

[FTA Docket No. FTA-2004-18959]

#### Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review

**AGENCY:** Federal Transit Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for extension of the currently approved information collection. The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments was published on June 1, 2004.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted before September 27, 2004. A comment to OMB is most effective if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sylvia L. Marion, Office of Administration, Office of Management Planning, (202) 366-6680.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*Title:* Reporting of Technical Activities by FTA Grant Recipients (*OMB Number: 2132-0549*).

*Abstract:* 49 U.S.C. Sections 5303 and 5313(a) and (b) authorize the use of federal funds to assist metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), states, and local public bodies in developing transportation plans and programs to serve future transportation needs of

urbanized areas and nonurbanized areas throughout the nation. As part of this effort, MPOs are required to consider a wide range of goals and objectives and to analyze alternative transportation system management and investment strategies. These objectives are measured by definable activities such as planning certification reviews and other related activities.

The information collected is used to report annually to Congress, the Secretary, and to the Federal Transit Administrator on how grantees are responding to national emphasis areas and congressional direction, and allows FTA to trace grantees' use of federal planning and research funds.

*Estimated Annual Burden:* 156 hours.

**ADDRESSES:** All written comments must refer to the docket number that appears at the top of this document and be submitted to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725-17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention: FTA Desk Officer.

*Comments Are Invited On:* Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility; the accuracy of the Department's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Issued: August 24, 2004.

**Ann M. Linnertz,**

*Deputy Associate Administrator for Administration.*

[FR Doc. 04-19633 Filed 8-26-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-57-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

#### Denial of Motor Vehicle Recall Petition

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

**ACTION:** Denial of petition for an investigation into the adequacy of a safety recall.

**SUMMARY:** This notice sets forth the reasons for the denial of a petition submitted to NHTSA under 49 U.S.C. 30120(e) by Ms. Angelique Trowbridge, requesting that the agency commence a

proceeding to determine the adequacy of the remedy utilized by Ford Motor Company (Ford) to address a safety-related defect in Ford Safety Recall 04S13 (NHTSA 04V-165). After a review of the petition and other information, NHTSA has concluded that further expenditure of the agency's investigative resources on the issues raised by the petition does not appear warranted. The agency accordingly has denied the petition. The petition is hereinafter identified as RP04-002.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mr. Thomas Z. Cooper, Chief, Vehicle Integrity Division, Office of Defects Investigation (ODI), NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: (202) 366-5218.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On June 22, 2004, NHTSA received a letter from Ms. Trowbridge requesting that the agency investigate the adequacy of the remedy used by Ford in Safety Recall 04S13 (NHTSA 04V-165). The petitioner alleges that the recall remedy is inadequate and, as evidence, states that after having the recall remedy performed on her model year (MY) 2001 Ford Escape, it did not resolve the stalling condition.

On April 5, 2004, Ford filed a Defect Information Report concerning intermittent closed throttle engine stalling in 321,903 MY 2001-2003 Ford Escape vehicles equipped with 3.0L V6 engines, manufactured between January 31, 2000 and September 11, 2002. Ford reported that an intermittent engine stalling condition is prevalent in these vehicles when the vehicle is in a closed throttle deceleration at speeds of 40 mph and below. The recall remedy involved reprogramming the calibration of the vehicle's Powertrain Control Module (PCM) to correct a rich air/fuel mixture, thereby allowing the engine to operate without experiencing a closed throttle, deceleration-stalling event.

Following receipt of the petition, on July 1, 2004, the Office of Defects Investigation (ODI) sent an information request to Ford to obtain relevant information. Ford's July 23, 2004 response indicates that less than 0.1 percent of vehicle owners who have had the recall remedy performed have reported additional deceleration stalling issues. Ford also states that the PCM has to "learn" the new program and that any subsequent stalling would be temporary. To verify Ford's claim, ODI conducted a random survey of 20 complainants who had the remedy performed on their vehicles and who experienced a subsequent stalling event. ODI found that most of them had isolated stalling problems, supporting Ford's allegation