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 the Theft Prevention Standard.

DATES: The exemption granted by this notice is effective beginning with the (confidential) model year.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms Barbara Gray, Office of Market Incentives, NHTSA, 400 Seventh St., S.W., Washington, DC. 20590. Ms Gray's telephone number is (202) 366-1740. Her fax number is (202) 493-2739.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In a petition dated June 16, 1995, American Honda Motor Co., Inc., requested on behalf of Honda Motor Co., Ltd., an exemption from the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard for a motor vehicle line. The nameplate of the line and the model year of introduction are confidential. The submittal requested an exemption from the parts-marking requirements pursuant to 49 CFR part 543, Exemption from Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard, based on the installation of an antitheft device as standard equipment for the entire line. In an August 9, 1995, telephone conversation with NHTSA officials, Honda clarified the scope of its petition.

Honda's June 16 letter and information provided in the August 9 telephone conversation, together constitute a complete petition, as required by 49 CFR part 543.7, in that it met the general requirements contained in § 543.5 and the specific content requirements of § 543.6. In a letter dated July 11, 1995, to Honda, the agency granted the petitioner's request for confidential treatment of most aspects of its petition, including the nameplate of the line and the model year of its introduction.

In its petition, Honda provided a detailed description and diagrams of the identity, design, and location of the components of the antitheft device for the new line. This antitheft device includes an engine starter-interrupt function and an alarm function. The antitheft device is activated by removing the ignition key and locking the doors with it. The alarm monitors the doors, hood, battery terminals and circuitry, and engine starter circuit.

In order to ensure the reliability and durability of the device, Honda stated that it conducted tests, based on its own specified standards. Honda provided a detailed list of the tests conducted. Honda stated its belief that the device is reliable and durable since the device complied with Honda's specified requirements for each test.

Honda compared the device proposed for its new line with devices which NHTSA has determined to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as would compliance with the parts-marking requirements.

Honda has concluded that the antitheft device proposed for its new line is no less effective than those devices in the lines for which NHTSA has already granted exemptions from the parts-marking requirements. Honda bases its belief on reduced theft rates of the Saab 900 and Lexus SC car lines. Both lines had experienced theft rates below the median theft rate (3.5826) set for Model Years (MY) 1990/1991. Additionally, Honda stated that the Honda Acura NSX has been equipped with an antitheft device since MY 1991. The theft rate of the NSX continues to be below the median theft rate (3.5826). Since the vehicle line that is the subject of this petition will be equipped with a similar system as the NSX, Honda expects that the antitheft device on the vehicle line for which it now seeks an exemption will also be as effective in reducing and deterring theft.

Based on the evidence submitted by Honda, the agency believes that the antitheft device for the new Honda 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 Standards (49 CFR part 541).

The agency believes that the device will provide the types of performance listed in 49 CFR 543.6(a)(3): Promoting activation, attracting attention to unauthorized entries, 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.

As required by 49 U.S.C. 331006 and 49 CFR 543.6(a) (4) and (5), the agency finds that Honda has provided adequate reasons for its belief that the antitheft device will reduce and deter theft. This conclusion is based on the information Honda provided about its device, much of which is confidential. This confidential information included a description of reliability and functional tests conducted by Honda for the antitheft device and its components.

For the foregoing reasons, the agency hereby grants in full Honda's petition for exemption for the line from the parts-marking requirements of 49 CFR part 541.

If Honda decides not to use the exemption for this line, it should formally notify the agency. If such a decision is made, the line must be fully marked according to the requirements under 49 CFR 541.5 and 541.6 (marking of major component parts and replacement parts).

NHTSA notes that if Honda 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 antitheft 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 which § 543.9(c)(2) could place on exempted vehicle manufacturers and itself.

The agency did not intend in drafting 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 with 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: September 22, 1995.

Barry Felrice,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 95–23989 Filed 9–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Customs Service

Receipt of Domestic Interested Party Petition Concerning Country of Origin Marking for Hinges

AGENCY: Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of domestic interested party petition; solicitation of comments.

SUMMARY: Customs has received a petition filed on behalf of a domestic interested party concerning the country of origin marking requirements for metal hinges. The petitioner requests that Customs require imported metal hinges to be marked individually by a die sunk, molding or etching process in a conspicuous place such as the exposed

surface of the hinge. The petitioner contends that the country of origin marking on the container in which hinges are imported is not sufficient. Public comment is solicited regarding the application of the marking requirements to imported metal hinges.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before November 27, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments (preferably in triplicate) may be submitted to the U.S. Customs Service, Regulations Branch, Office of Regulations and Rulings, 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW. (Franklin Court), Washington, DC. 20229. Comments may be viewed at the Office of Regulations and Rulings, Franklin Court, 1099 14th Street, NW., Suite 4000, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Monika Rice, Special Classification and Marking Branch, Office of Regulations and Rulings, U.S. Customs Service, (202–482–6980).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Pursuant to section 516, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1516) and part 175, Customs Regulations (19 CFR part 175), a domestic interested party may challenge certain decisions made by Customs regarding imported merchandise which is claimed to be similar to the class or kind of merchandise manufactured, produced or wholesaled by the domestic interested party. This document provides notice that a domestic interested party is challenging the marking requirements of imported metal hinges.

The petitioner is Hager Hinge Company, a domestic manufacturer of hinges. This entity qualifies as a domestic interested party within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1516(a)(2).

Section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1304), provides that, unless excepted, every article of foreign origin shall be marked in a conspicuous place with the English name of the country of origin. The country of origin marking requirements and exceptions of 19 U.S.C. 1304 are implemented by part 134, Customs Regulations (19 CFR part 134).

The hinges at issue are classifiable under subheading 8302.10.60 or subheading 8302.10.90, Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS), depending on the material of construction which basically is brass, aluminum, steel, or stainless steel. Hinges are stamped from dies with knuckles rolled, milled or reamed; assembled with bearings, if required; polished to remove impurities on the face or knuckle; and electroplated. Steel hinges are described as having great strength, which can be electroplated with various finishes, and are most commonly used in controlled environments, such as the interior of a building. Stainless steel hinges are also described as having great strength, are non-corrosive, and can be polished to either bright or satin finishes, but may not be electroplated in the same manner as steel. Brass hinges are described as having less strength than steel or stainless steel, and may not be used on fire rated door applications, but may be electroplated with many finishes. Additionally, there are four basic types of hinges: Full Mortise (the most common, comprising 90 percent of all hinges used), Full Surface, Half Mortise, and Half Surface. A Full Mortise hinge is mortised to both the door and the frame; the Full Surface hinge is affixed to the surface (not recessed) of the door and the frame; the Half Mortise hinge is mortised to the door (recessed) and surface applied to the frame; and the Half Surface hinge is surface applied to the door and mortised to the frame (recessed). The hinges described above are stated to be sold through distributors for sale in hardware stores and home centers, and are also sold in bulk to general and sub-contractors for use in building construction.

The petitioner contends that the country of origin marking on these imported metal hinges be placed onto each individual hinge by a die sunk, molding or etching process in a conspicuous place such as the exposed surface of the hinge. The petitioner contends that the country of origin marking on the container in which the hinges are imported is not sufficient because, in practice, the hinges are often removed from their container before reaching the ultimate purchaser. In a retail setting, hinges may be removed from their container and sold from bulk bins for easy access and examination. Furthermore, in building construction, the petitioner contends that the building purchaser has less likelihood of ascertaining the country of origin which is important in determining the quality of a building's construction. The petitioner contends that despite the certification requirements imposed by 19 CFR 134.26 for repackaged articles, and the demand for liquidated damages under 19 CFR 134.54(a) for failure to adhere to the certification, anything less than individual marking on each metal hinge is statutorily insufficient. Consequently, the petitioner proposes that Customs require imported metal hinges to be marked individually by a die sunk, molding or etching process in a conspicuous place because as stated in 19 CFR 134.41, as a general rule, marking requirements are best met by marking worked into the article at the time of manufacture and it is suggested that the country of origin on metal articles be die sunk, molded, or etched.

Comments

Pursuant to § 175.21(a), Customs Regulations (19 CFR 175.21(a)), before making a determination on this matter, Customs invites written comments from interested parties. The petition of the domestic interested party, as well as all comments received in response to this notice, will be available for public inspection in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552), § 1.4, Treasury Department Regulations (31 CFR 1.4), and § 103.11(b), Customs Regulations (19 CFR 103.11(b)), on regular business days between the hours of 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. at the Regulations Branch, Suite 4000, Franklin Court, 1099 14th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

AUTHORITY

This notice is published in accordance with § 175.21(a), Customs Regulations (19 CFR 175.21(a)).

Drafting Information

The principal drafter of this document was Monika Rice, Special Classification and Marking Branch, United States Customs Service. Personnel from other Customs offices participated in its development.

George J. Weise,

Commissioner of Customs.

Approved: August 28, 1995.

John P. Simpson

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury

[FR Doc. 95–23953 Filed 9–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4820–02–P

Georgraphic Boundaries of Customs Brokerage, Cartage, and Lighterage Districts

AGENCY: Customs Service, Treasury.

ACTION: General notice.

SUMMARY: This document informs the public of the geographic areas covered for purposes of Customs broker permits and for certain cartage and lighterage purposes where the word ''district'' appears in the Customs Regulations.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 30, 1995 at 11:59 p.m. EST.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jerry Laderberg, Office of Field Operations (202)927–0415.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: