

the inboard sidewall, the full and correct tire code (including the correct manufacturer's identification mark) is available on the intended outboard sidewall. In addition, Cooper stated that the tires are marked with the Cooper Weather-Master S/T2 brand name that is exclusively owned by Cooper Tire & Rubber Company.

Cooper also indicated that it has taken the following steps to ensure proper registration of the subject tires:

(a) Cooper has informed all internal personnel responsible for manual processing of tire registration cards about the "U8" issue so that cards containing the "U8" designation will be accepted and properly processed when all other information accurately identifies the subject tires. And, Cooper will follow up with the consumer seeking additional information by providing a prepaid response card.

(b) Cooper is in the process of modifying its database to accept "U8" when other information (brand, serial weeks affected etc.) is accurate.

(c) Cooper has contacted Computerized Information and Management Services, Inc. (CIMS) so that tire registration cards will not be rejected solely due to improper plant code information.

Cooper additionally informed NHTSA that on May 29, 2015 the incorrect mold was pulled and the stamping error that caused the subject noncompliance was corrected at that time.

Refer to Coopers' petition for their complete reasoning. The petition and all supporting documents are available by logging onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Web site at: <http://www.regulations.gov/> and following the online search instructions to locate the docket number listed in the title of this notice.

In summation, Cooper believes that the described noncompliance of the subject tires is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that its petition, to exempt Cooper from providing recall notification of noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30118 and remedying the recall noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30120 should be granted.

#### NHTSA'S Decision

**NHTSA's Analysis:** While the first grouping of the tire identification number (TIN) on the subject tires is marked with the incorrect manufacturer's identification code "U8," instead of the correct code "U9," this mismarking is only on the inner sidewall. The correct full TIN is properly marked on the outside sidewall, and the correct corporate

brand name is marked on both sidewalls. NHTSA believes this noncompliance will not cause misidentification of the tire manufacturer should a safety defect be identified in the subject tires.

Cooper additionally informed NHTSA that the subject tires meet and/or exceed all performance requirements and all other labeling markings as required by FMVSS No. 139 and that Cooper is not aware of any crashes, injuries, customer complaints, or field reports associated with the subject tires.

Cooper also notified NHTSA that proper registration of the tires will be accepted with the erroneous code. Cooper collectively worked with CIMS (Computerized Information and Management Services), Inc., to ensure that the subject tires are correctly registered regardless of the incorrect code.

The agency believes that the true measure of inconsequentiality to motor vehicle safety in this case is that there is no effect of the noncompliance on the operational safety of vehicles on which these tires are mounted and that the manufacturer of the tires can be readily identified.

Cooper also informed NHTSA that on May 29, 2015 it corrected the mold problem that originated the noncompliance.

**NHTSA Decision:** In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA finds that Cooper has met its burden of persuasion that the subject FMVSS No. 139 noncompliance in the affected tires is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, Cooper's petition is hereby granted and Cooper is consequently exempted from the obligation of providing notification of, and a free remedy for, the subject noncompliance under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120.

NHTSA notes that the statutory provisions (49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h)) that permit manufacturers to file petitions for a determination of inconsequentiality allow NHTSA to exempt manufacturers only from the duties found in sections 30118 and 30120, respectively, to notify owners, purchasers, and dealers of a defect or noncompliance and to remedy the defect or noncompliance. Therefore, this decision only applies to the subject tires that Cooper no longer controlled at the time it determined that the noncompliance existed. However, the granting of this petition does not relieve tire distributors and dealers of the prohibitions on the sale, offer for sale, or introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of the noncompliant tires under their

control after Cooper notified them that the subject noncompliance existed.

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; Delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.95 and 501.8.

**Jeffrey M. Giuseppe,**

*Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.*  
[FR Doc. 2016-04698 Filed 3-3-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2016-0025; Notice 1]

#### BMW of North America, LLC, Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

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

**ACTION:** Receipt of petition.

**SUMMARY:** BMW of North America, LLC (BMW), has determined that certain model year (MY) 2016 BMW 7 Series passenger cars do not fully comply with paragraph S7.7.13.3 of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 108, *Lamps, reflective devices and associated equipment*. BMW filed a report dated January 21, 2016, pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports*. BMW then petitioned NHTSA under 49 CFR part 556 requesting a decision that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

**DATES:** The closing date for comments on the petition is April 4, 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on this petition. Comments must refer to the docket and notice number cited in the title of this notice and submitted by any of the following methods:

- **Mail:** Send comments by mail addressed to: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590.
- **Hand Deliver:** Deliver comments by hand to: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. except Federal Holidays.
- **Electronically:** Submit comments electronically by: Logging onto the Federal Docket Management System

(FDMS) Web site at <http://www.regulations.gov/>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Comments may also be faxed to (202) 493-2251.

Comments must be written in the English language, and be no greater than 15 pages in length, although there is no limit to the length of necessary attachments to the comments. If comments are submitted in hard copy form, please ensure that two copies are provided. If you wish to receive confirmation that comments you have submitted by mail were received, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard with the comments. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov/>, including any personal information provided.

The petition, supporting materials, and all comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated above will be filed in the docket and will be considered. All comments and supporting materials received after the closing date will also be filed and will be considered to the extent possible.

When the petition is granted or denied, notice of the decision will also be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated at the end of this notice.

All documents submitted to the docket may be viewed by anyone at the address and times given above. The documents may also be viewed on the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov/> by following the online instructions for accessing the dockets. The docket ID number for this petition is shown at the heading of this notice.

DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement is available for review in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000, (65 FR 19477-78).

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

I. *Overview:* Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) (see implementing rule at 49 CFR part 556), BMW submitted a petition for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

This notice of receipt of BMW's petition is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the petition.

II. *Vehicles Involved:* Affected are approximately 5,076 MY 2016 BMW 7 Series passenger cars that were manufactured between August 03, 2015 and November 20, 2015.

III. *Noncompliance:* BMW states that the rear license plate lamp may not fully conform to paragraph S7.7.13.3 of FMVSS No. 108 because it exceeds the illumination ratio specified in that paragraph.

IV. *Rule Text:* Paragraph S7.7.13.3 of FMVSS No. 108 requires, in pertinent part:

S7.7.13.3 The ratio of the average of the two highest illumination values divided by the average of the two lowest illumination values must not exceed 20:1 for vehicles other than motorcycles and motor driven cycles.

V. *Summary of BMW's Petition:* BMW described the subject noncompliance and stated its belief that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety for the following reasons:

- The out-of-specification lamps satisfy all other requirements of FMVSS No. 108.
- The out-of-specification lamps only deviate from paragraph 7.7.13.3 of FMVSS No. 108 with regard to the lamp's illumination ratio and not the lamp's actual illumination.
- Personnel who participated in a company assessment reported no difference in their visual perception of the simulated license plates that were used as test specimens.
- BMW has not received any customer complaints related to the issue.
- BMW is not aware of any accidents or injuries related to this issue.
- NHTSA has previously granted petitions in which the illumination of test points remains well above the requirements.
- Vehicle production has been corrected.

In support of its petition, BMW submitted the following information pertaining to laboratory testing and analysis of the subject noncompliance:

(1) *FMVSS No. 108 Lamp Certification:* BMW submitted a test report dated April 7, 2015 pertaining to lamps manufactured by U-SHIN Italia S.p.A. (U-SHIN) prior to vehicle production. According to BMW, this report indicates that the lamp satisfies FMVSS No. 108 requirements, as the ratio of the average of the two highest illumination values divided by the average of the two lowest illumination values is 14.1, and FMVSS No. 108 requires that the value be less than 20.

(2) *Evaluation by Measurement Equipment:* Both BMW and U-SHIN performed a number of tests of both in-specification and out-of-specification lamps to assess the performance of the subject lamps to the pertinent

requirement of FMVSS No. 108. BMW submitted one representative test report for each test condition. The results are as follows:

- U-SHIN out-of-specification lamp tests:* These showed an illumination ratio of 22.0. BMW noted, however, that each of the eight (8) test points satisfies the applicable FMVSS No. 108 photometric (illumination) requirements.
- BMW out-of-specification lamp tests:* BMW performed its own out-of-specification tests to verify U-SHIN's test results and to obtain results for the lamps when equipped within a vehicle. These showed an illumination ratio of 22.2. BMW noted, however, that each of the eight (8) test points satisfies the applicable FMVSS No. 108 photometric (illumination) requirements.
- U-SHIN in-specification lamp tests:* These showed an illumination ratio of 13.8. As with the previously described tests, BMW noted, however, that each of the eight (8) test points satisfies the applicable FMVSS No. 108 photometric (illumination) requirements.
- BMW in-specification tests:* BMW performed their own in-specification tests to verify U-SHIN's test results and to obtain results for the lamps when equipped within a vehicle. These showed an illumination ratio of 13.9. BMW again noted, however, that each of the eight (8) test points satisfies the applicable FMVSS No. 108 applicable photometric (illumination) requirements.

(3) *Evaluation by human assessment:* In addition to the laboratory testing performed by both BMW and U-SHIN using specific lamp measurement equipment, BMW also compared the out-of-specification lamps to the in-specification lamps via human assessment. BMW performed this assessment to determine whether or not the condition caused by the non-compliance was perceptible to other road users (*i.e.*, drivers approaching an affected vehicle) and, if so, its effect on safety.

BMW submitted photographs that depict the illumination of a test specimen simulating a rear license plate by both in-specification and out-of-specification lamps. According to BMW, while there may be a slightly perceptible difference in the photographs depicting the test specimen illuminated by in-specification and out-of-specification lamps, this is due to tolerances of the camera equipment related to exposure time and shutter speed. BMW stated that the personnel

who participated in this assessment reported no difference in their visual perception of the test specimens.

Additionally, BMW noted that even for the out-of-specification lamp, all of the eight (8) test points satisfy the applicable FMVSS No. 108 photometric (illumination) requirements. BMW emphasized that the noncompliance pertains to the illumination ratio, not to the actual lamp illumination. As a consequence, BMW asserts that while the noncompliance condition can be measured in a laboratory, it cannot be detected by the human eye, and therefore drivers of approaching vehicles will be afforded the same level of visibility as if approaching a non-affected vehicle. According to BMW, these analyses support the conclusion that the condition caused by the noncompliance does not affect the safety of affected vehicle occupants or other road users such as drivers approaching affected vehicles.

(4) *Field Experience*: BMW states that its Customer Relations division has not received any contacts from vehicle owners regarding the matter at issue. As a consequence, BMW believes that, consistent with the results of the laboratory tests and human assessments described above, the condition is undetectable to road users such as drivers approaching affected vehicles. BMW further notes that it is not aware of any accidents or injuries that have occurred as a result of the condition.

(5) *Prior NHTSA Rulings*: BMW states that NHTSA has previously granted petitions from other manufacturers involving various issues pertaining to FMVSS No. 108 noncompliance. BMW believes that in some of those petitions, the photometry (illumination) of the test points remains well above the FMVSS No. 108 requirements as the noncompliance has no effect upon the illumination of the test points.

(6) *Vehicle Production*: BMW stated that subsequent vehicle production has been corrected to conform to paragraph 7.7.13.3 of FMVSS No. 108.

In summation, BMW expressed the belief that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that its petition, to exempt BMW from providing notification of the noncompliance, as required by 49 U.S.C. 30118, and remedying the noncompliance, as required by 49 U.S.C. 30120, should be granted.

NHTSA notes that the statutory provisions (49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h)) that permit manufacturers to file petitions for a determination of inconsequentiality allow NHTSA to exempt manufacturers only from the duties found in sections 30118 and

30120, respectively, to notify owners, purchasers, and dealers of a defect or noncompliance and to remedy the defect or noncompliance. Therefore, any decision on this petition only applies to the subject vehicles that BMW no longer controlled at the time it determined that the noncompliance existed. However, any decision on this petition does not relieve vehicle distributors and dealers of the prohibitions on the sale, offer for sale, or introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of the noncompliant vehicles under their control after BMW notified them that the subject noncompliance existed.

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.95 and 501.8.

**Jeffrey M. Giuseppe,**  
*Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.*  
[FR Doc. 2016-04862 Filed 3-3-16; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

[Docket No. DOT-OST-2016-0033]

### Agency Request for Emergency Approval of an Information Collection

**AGENCY:** Office of the Secretary of Transportation (OST), DOT.

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

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the Department of Transportation (DOT) provides notice that it will submit an information collection requests (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for emergency approval of a proposed information collection. Upon receiving the requested six-month emergency approval by OMB, the Office of the Secretary of Transportation (OST) will follow the normal PRA procedures to obtain extended approval for this proposed information collection. The collection of information is necessary in order to receive applications for grant funds pursuant to Section 1105 of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act of 2015, which was signed into law on December 4, 2015. Section 1105 establishes a new program for OST to provide Supplemental Discretionary Grants for a Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects (NSFHP) program. The Department will also refer to NSFHP grants as Fostering Advancements in Shipping and Transportation for the Long-term Achievement of National Efficiencies (FASTLANE) grants. The FAST Act provides specific deadlines for this

program, including a statutory 60-day Congressional notification requirement, which is no later than July 30, 2016. In order to ensure that the NSFHP grants are awarded in an expeditious manner and in the timeframes established by the FAST Act, the Department requests approval of an information collection using OMB's emergency processing system to meet Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) requirements.

Information related to this ICR, including applicable supporting documentation may be obtained by contacting the NSFHP program manager via email at [NSFHP@dot.gov](mailto:NSFHP@dot.gov).

**DATES:** Comments should be submitted as soon as possible upon publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Comments and questions should be directed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA), Attn: OST OMB Desk Officer, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503. Comments and questions about the ICR identified below may be transmitted electronically to OIRA at [oira\\_submissions@omb.eop.gov](mailto:oira_submissions@omb.eop.gov).

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

**OMB Control Number:** 2105-XXXX  
**Title:** Supplemental Discretionary Grants for a Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects (NSFHP) program, or NSFHP program.

**Type of Review:** Emergency information collection request.

**Expected Number of Respondents:** Approximately 200.

**Frequency:** The Department expects that this information collection will occur up to five times—once per fiscal year—from FY 2016 through FY 2020.

**Estimated Average Burden per Response:** 100 hours.

**Estimated Total Annual Burden:** 20,000.

**Abstract:** On December 4, 2015, President Obama signed into law the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act, or "FAST Act." It is the first law enacted in over ten years that provides long-term funding certainty for surface transportation. The FAST Act authorized at \$4.5 billion for fiscal years (FY) 2016 through 2020, including \$800 million for FY 2016 to be awarded by the Department of Transportation (the "Department") on a competitive basis to projects of national or regional significance. The funds provided by NSFHP program will be awarded on a competitive basis to projects that have a significant impact on the Nation, a metropolitan area, or a region. On or about the date hereof, the Department published a solicitation for applications for NSFHP grants. The solicitation announces the availability of funding