

State and county	Location	Date and name of newspaper where notice was published	Chief executive officer of community	Effective date of modified flood insurance rate map	New community No
Oregon: Clatsop.....	City of Cannon Beach.....	<i>Daily Astorian</i> , Mar. 26, 1981, Mar. 27, 1981.	Honorable John Williams, Mayor, City of Cannon Beach, P.O. Box 368, Cannon Beach, Oregon 97110.	Mar. 3, 1981 (66-B).....	410029B.
Tennessee: Williamson.	City of Franklin.....	<i>Review-Appeal</i> , Mar. 20, 1981, Mar. 27, 1981.	Honorable Dr. Jeffrey Bethum, Mayor, City of Franklin, P.O. Box 305, Franklin, Tennessee 37060.	Mar. 16, 1981.....	470206B.
Texas:					
Aransas.....	City of Rockport.....	<i>Rockport Pilot</i> , Mar. 26, 1981, Apr. 2, 1981.	Honorable Walter S. Falk, Jr., Mayor, City of Rockport, 219 North Broadway, Rockport, Texas 78382.	Mar. 3, 1981 (66-B).....	485904C.
Brazoria.....	City of Alvin.....	<i>Alvin Sun</i> , Aug. 13, 1980, Aug. 14, 1980.	Honorable Allen Gray, Mayor, City of Alvin, 216 West Sedy Street, Alvin, Texas 77511.	Mar. 24, 1981.....	485451E.

(National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (Title XIII of Housing and Urban Development Act 1968), effective January 28, 1969 (33 FR 17804, November 28, 1968), as amended; 42 U.S.C. 4001-4128; Executive Order 12127, 44 FR 19367; and delegation of authority to Federal Insurance Administrator)

Issued: June 4, 1981.

Robert G. Chappell, P.E.,

Acting Assistant Administrator, Federal Insurance Administration.

[FR Doc. 81-18211 Filed 6-19-81; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718-03-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Research and Special Programs Administration

49 CFR Part 172

[Docket No. HM-171; Amdt. No. 68]

Use of United Nations Shipping Descriptions; Correction

AGENCY: Materials Transportation Bureau (MTB), Research and Special Programs Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects a final rule issued under Docket HM-171, Use of United Nations Shipping Descriptions, which was published in the Federal Register on Monday, June 1, 1981 (46 FR 29392). This action is necessary to correct certain errors in the Optional Hazardous Materials Table published in that rule. Since use of the Optional Hazardous Materials Table is not mandatory, this rule will not impose an undue burden on persons affected by the regulations.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 22, 1981.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Edward A. Altemos (202-426-0656), Office of Hazardous Materials Regulation, Materials Transportation Bureau, Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20590. Office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: As indicated in the final rule published June 1, 1981, the Optional Hazardous Materials Table was amended to reflect changes published in Amendments 17-79 and 18-79 to the Inter-Governmental

Maritime Consultative Organization's International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code (IMCO Code). Since the publication of the final rule, several errors have been noted. The primary purpose of this amendment is to correct these errors in order to maintain consistency between the Optional Table and the IMCO Code.

Specific changes to entries are as follows:

(1) In two instances proper shipping names were revised but cross references to the proper shipping names were not correspondingly amended. These cross-references are appropriately corrected by this document.

(2) The entries "Solvents, (toxic), n.o.s." and "Solvents, (non-toxic), n.o.s.," and the entry "Cleaning compounds, liquid, corrosive" were deleted from the IMCO Code by Amendments 17-79 and 18-79 respectively but were inadvertently retained in the Optional Table. Since these entries are no longer acceptable descriptions in the IMCO Code, they are being deleted from the Optional Table.

(3) The series of symbols "< -&" was inadvertently printed in nine entries in the Optional Table. This series of symbols is being deleted wherever it appears.

When the Optional Table was republished, asterisks (*) were inserted in Column (1) of the table to assist the reader in identifying new or amended entries. Since these asterisks were intended as guidance material only and are not to appear in the next reprint of the Optional Table in the Code of Federal Regulations this amendment also deletes all asterisks which appear in Column (1) of the Optional Table.

Since this rule does not impose mandatory additional requirements,

notice and procedure thereon are considered unnecessary.

In consideration of the foregoing, the Optional Hazardous Materials Table in § 172.102, page 29392, is corrected as follows:

§ 172.102 [Corrected]

(a) On page 29402, the entry "Butyl phosphoric acid. See Acid butyl phosphate" is corrected to read "Butyl phosphoric acid. See Butyl acid phosphate"

(b) On page 29425, the entry "Phenylacetone nitrile. See Benzyl cyanide, liquid" is removed.

(c) On page 29431, the entry "Solvents, (non-toxic), n.o.s." is removed.

(d) On page 29431, the entry "Solvents, (toxic), n.o.s." is removed.

(e) On page 29405, the entry "Cleaning compounds, liquid, corrosive" is removed.

(f) The symbol "*" is deleted wherever it appears in Column (1).

(g) The series of symbols "< -&" is deleted wherever it appears in Column (2).

Note.—The Materials Transportation Bureau has determined that since this rule does not impose additional requirements and should have the net result of reducing costs and duplicative regulatory burdens, this document will not result in a "major rule" under the terms of Executive Order 12291, nor is it a "significant regulation" under DOT's regulatory policy and procedures (44 FR 11034). Furthermore, this rule does not require an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act (49 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.). A regulatory evaluation and an environmental assessment are available for review in the docket.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on June 15, 1981.

L. D. Santman,
Director, Materials Transportation Bureau.
[FR Doc. 81-18266 Filed 6-19-81; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910-80-M

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. 1-21; Notice 6]

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Theft Protection

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

ACTION: Final rule; response to petitions for reconsideration.

SUMMARY: This notice responds to ten petitions for reconsideration concerning Safety Standard No. 114, *Theft Protection*. In response to the petitions, the agency is (1) exempting walk-in vans from the requirements of the standard; (2) exempting open-body type vehicles with readily removable or no doors from the key-in-ignition warning requirement; (3) clarifying the provision which requires a manufacturer to have 1,000 different key combinations for each type of vehicle; and (4) deleting the provision, adopted in the last notice, that is designed to prevent the driver from inadvertently locking the steering column while his or her vehicle is in motion. This notice also makes a technical amendment to the standard.

DATES: The amendment deleting the inadvertent activation requirements for passenger cars is effective on September 1, 1982. The remaining amendments become effective on September 1, 1983. This is the effective date previously established for Standard No. 114 to become applicable to trucks and multipurpose passenger vehicles (MPV's) having a gross vehicle weight rating of 10,000 pounds or less.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Nelson Erickson, Office of Vehicle Safety Standards, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20590 (202-426-2720).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On December 29, 1980, NHTSA published in the Federal Register (45 FR 85450) a final rule making certain amendments to Safety Standard No. 114, *Theft Protection* (49 CFR 571.114). These amendments extended the applicability of the standard to trucks and multipurpose passenger vehicles (MPV's) with a gross vehicle weight

rating (GVWR) of 10,000 pounds or less. The amendments also upgraded the performance requirements of the standard to prevent the driver from inadvertently locking the steering wheel while his or her vehicle is in motion.

Petitions for reconsideration were subsequently filed within the prescribed time limits by the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association (MVMA), BMW of North America, Inc. (BMW), American Motors Corporation (AMC), Alfa Romeo, General Motors Corporation (GM), Volkswagen of America, Inc. (VW), Fiat Motors of North America, Inc. (Fiat), Chrysler Corporation (Chrysler), Automobile Importers of America, Inc. (AIA), and Mercedes-Benz of North America, Inc. (Mercedes). In addition, Renault U.S.A., Inc., filed a comment with the agency in which it concurred in the petitions filed by VW and AIA. After evaluating these petitions, the agency has decided to modify, as fully detailed below, some of the requirements of the standard. The agency is also making a technical amendment to the standard in this notice. To the extent set forth below, the petitions are granted. Otherwise, they are denied.

Exemption for Walk-In Vans and Open-Body Type Vehicles

In general, the reaction of the petitioners to the amendments extending the standard to light trucks and vans was positive. Chrysler stated that Standard No. 114 has been effective in deterring motor vehicle theft by amateur thieves and joyriders and thus it approves of the extension. However, several petitioners asked for an exemption from all or parts of the rule for specific types of vehicles.

GM requested that walk-in vans be exempted from all of the standard's requirements. (A walk-in van is a "step-van" city delivery type of vehicle that permits a driver to enter the vehicle without stooping. Such vans are typically used to deliver lightweight, bulky merchandise such as bakery products or dry cleaning. GM describes a walk-in van as a forward control chassis which it designates as a "P truck.") GM argues that such vehicles should be exempted from the standard because there are no data to indicate a significant theft problem with these vans. Walk-in vans are exempted from the requirements of Safety Standards Nos. 203, 204, 212, and 219 because compliance with these standards "would not accomplish the safety benefits projected for passenger cars" and because these vehicles are used for low-speed city delivery service and thus are not exposed to the risk of high-speed

accidents. According to GM, the lack of data indicating a theft problem provides a similar reason for exempting walk-in vans from Standard No. 114. GM notes that without the exemption, a new steering column might have to be designed, tested, tooled and manufactured for this vehicle. The petitioner suggests that the cost of such a column to purchasers could be "significant" since a low number of walk-in vans are produced.

The fact that GM might have to redesign the steering column used in these vehicles if it is forced to comply with the rule is not dispositive by itself. Compliance with any new standard or amendment to an existing rule typically requires a vehicle or equipment manufacturer to make design or tooling changes. This fact is considered by the agency in deciding whether to adopt a proposed rule or amendment.

However, the agency has decided to exempt walk-in vans from the requirements of Standard No. 114. Walk-in vans are generally commercial vehicles that have minimal capacity to accelerate and thus are not attractive to the youthful joyrider. NHTSA expects that as a result the theft rate of these vehicles is considerably less than the theft rate of other light trucks and vans. The theft rate of walk-in vans manufactured by Chevrolet and GMC supports this. The 1979 nationwide theft rate of all registered model years 1972-1980 walk-in vans manufactured by Chevrolet and GMC was one-third of the 1979 nationwide theft rate of all registered model years 1972-1980 light trucks that were built by these companies. NHTSA derived this statistic from information supplied by R. L. Polk, Inc. and National Automobile Theft Bureau. Thus NHTSA has decided to grant GM's petition and exempt walk-in vans from the requirements of the standard. However, the agency will continue to monitor the theft and accident rates of these vehicles, and will initiate rulemaking should the data indicate that application of the standard's requirements would yield a significant safety benefit.

AMC and MVMA requested that open-body type vehicles which lack a driver's door or have one that can be readily removed be exempted from the standard's key-warning requirements (paragraph S4.7 of the December 1980 final rule, renumbered S4.5 in today's rule). (An open-body type vehicle is a vehicle that has no occupant compartment top or one that can be installed or removed by the user at his or her convenience.) The petitioners argued that it is impracticable and