

S5.5 Tire markings. Except as specified in paragraphs (a) through (i) of S5.5, each tire must be marked on each sidewall with the information specified in S5.5(a) through (d) and on one sidewall with the information specified in S5.5(e) through (i) according to the phase-in schedule specified in S7 of this standard. The markings must be placed between the maximum section width and the bead on at least one sidewall, unless the maximum section width of the tire is located in an area that is not more than one-fourth of the distance from the bead to the shoulder of the tire. If the maximum section width falls within that area, those markings must appear between the bead and a point one-half the distance from the bead to the shoulder of the tire, on at least one sidewall. The markings must be in letters and numerals not less than 0.078 inches high and raised above or sunk below the tire surface not less than 0.015 inches* * *

(e) The generic name of each cord material used in the plies (both sidewall and tread area) of the tire;

(f) The actual number of plies in the sidewall, and the actual number of plies in the tread area, if different* * *

Goodyear explains that the noncompliance is that, due to a mold labeling error, the sidewall marking incorrectly describes the plies in the tread area of the tires. Specifically, the tires in question were inadvertently manufactured with "Tread 2 Polyester + 2 Steel + 1 Nylon" marked on the sidewall. The labeling should have been "Tread 2 Polyester + 2 Steel."

Goodyear makes the argument that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety because the noncompliant sidewall marking does not affect the safety of the tire and that the tires as built are in compliance with all other sidewall identification markings and all applicable tire performance requirements specified in FMVSS No. 139.

Goodyear points out that NHTSA has previously granted petitions for sidewall marking noncompliances that it believes are similar to the instant noncompliance.

Goodyear also stated that it has corrected the problem that caused these errors so that they will not be repeated in future production.

In summation, Goodyear states that it believes that because the noncompliances are inconsequential to motor vehicle safety that no corrective action is warranted.

NHTSA Decision

The agency agrees with Goodyear that the noncompliances are inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. 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.

Although tire construction affects the strength and durability, neither the agency nor the tire industry provides information relating tire strength and durability to the number of plies and types of ply cord material in the tread and sidewall. Therefore, tire dealers and customers should consider the tire construction information along with other information such as the load capacity, maximum inflation pressure, and tread wear, temperature, and traction ratings, to assess performance capabilities of various tires. In the agency's judgment, the incorrect labeling of the tire construction information will have an inconsequential effect on motor vehicle safety because most consumers do not base tire purchases or vehicle operation parameters on the ply material or number of plies in a tire.

The agency also believes the noncompliance will have no measurable effect on the safety of the tire retread, repair, and recycling industries. The use of steel cord construction in the sidewall and tread is the primary safety concern of these industries. In this case, since the tire sidewalls are marked correctly for the number of steel plies, this potential safety concern does not exist.

In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that Goodyear has met its burden of persuasion that the subject FMVSS No. 139 labeling noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, Goodyear's petition is granted and the petitioner is exempted from the obligation of providing notification of, and a remedy for, the subject noncompliance under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120.

Authority: (49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120: delegations of authority at CFR 1.50 and 501.8)

Issued on: December 17, 2009.

Claude Harris,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. E9-30444 Filed 12-22-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Seventh Meeting, Special Committee 213/EUROCAE WG 79: Enhanced Flight Vision Systems/Synthetic Vision Systems (EFVS/SVS)

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of RTCA Special Committee 213/EUROCAE WG 79: Enhanced Flight Vision Systems/Synthetic Vision Systems (EFVS/SVS).

SUMMARY: The FAA is issuing this notice to advise the public of a meeting of RTCA Special Committee 213/EUROCAE WG 79: Enhanced Flight Vision Systems/Synthetic Vision Systems (EFVS/SVS).

DATES: The meeting will be held January 26–28, 2010. Sign-in: 8:30 a.m. on January 26, 2010. Meeting: 9 a.m.–5 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at FAA Long Beach Aircraft Evaluation Group (LGB AEG), 3960 Paramount Blvd., Lakewood, California 90712–4137, 1st Floor Conference Rooms A, B, & C, 562–627–5216 (conf. room A).

Objective: Per Terms of Reference, this meeting will review draft MASPS for EFVS approach and landing and potential draft MASPS material for SVS.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: (1) RTCA Secretariat, 1828 L Street, NW., Suite 805, Washington, DC 20036; telephone (202) 833–9339; fax (202) 833–9434; Web site <http://www.rtca.org>. For further meeting information, contact Harold Moses 202–330–0654; Web site HMoses@rtca.org

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (P.L. 92–463, 5 U.S.C., Appendix 2), notice is hereby given for a Special Committee 213/EUROCAE WG 79: Enhanced Flight Vision Systems/Synthetic Vision Systems (EFVS/SVS) meeting. The agenda will include:

Tuesday, 26 January

- Sign-in at 8:30 a.m.;
- 9 a.m.–5 p.m.—Plenary (including breaks and lunch);
- Welcome, introductions, review agenda, minutes approval, and objectives;
- Plenary work group updates, action item review;
- Separate work group 1 and 2 discussions if needed.

Wednesday, 27 January

- 9 a.m.–5 p.m.—Plenary including breaks and lunch.

Thursday, 28 January

- 9 a.m.–3 p.m.—Plenary (including breaks and lunch);
- Agree on draft MASPS;
- Review action items;
- Review administrative items.

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability. With the approval of the chairmen,

members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present statements or obtain information should contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. Members of the public may present a written statement to the committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, DC, on December 15, 2009.

Francisco Estrada C.,

RTCA Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. E9-30437 Filed 12-22-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

[FHWA Docket No. FHWA-2009-0119]

Surface Transportation Project Delivery Pilot Program; Caltrans Audit Report

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice; request for comment.

SUMMARY: Section 6005 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) established the Surface Transportation Project Delivery Pilot Program, codified at 23 U.S.C. 327. To ensure compliance by each State participating in the Pilot Program, 23 U.S.C. 327(g) mandates semiannual audits during each of the first 2 years of State participation. This notice announces and solicits comments on the fourth audit report for the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before January 22, 2010.

ADDRESSES: Mail or hand deliver comments to Docket Management Facility: U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Room W12-140, Washington, DC 20590. You may also submit comments electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov>, or fax comments to (202) 493-2251.

All comments should include the docket number that appears in the heading of this document. All comments received will be available for examination and copying at the above address from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Those desiring notification of receipt of comments must include a self-addressed, stamped postcard or you may print the acknowledgment page that appears after submitting comments electronically. Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments in

any one of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, or labor union). You may review the DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000, (Volume 65, Number 70, Pages 19477-78) or you may visit <http://DocketsInfo.dot.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Ruth Rentch, Office of Project Development and Environmental Review, (202)-366-2034, Ruth.Rentch@dot.gov, or Mr. Michael Harkins, Office of the Chief Counsel, (202) 366-4928, Michael.Harkins@dot.gov, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590. Office hours are from 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Access

An electronic copy of this notice may be downloaded from the Office of the Federal Register's home page at <http://www.archives.gov> and the Government Printing Office's Web site at <http://www.access.gpo.gov>.

Background

Section 6005 of SAFETEA-LU (codified at 23 U.S.C. 327) established a pilot program to allow up to five States to assume the Secretary of Transportation's responsibilities for environmental review, consultation, or other actions under any Federal environmental law pertaining to the review or approval of highway projects. In order to be selected for the pilot program, a State must submit an application to the Secretary.

On June 29, 2007, Caltrans and FHWA entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that established the assignments to and assumptions of responsibility to Caltrans. Under the MOU, Caltrans assumed the majority of FHWA's responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act, as well as the FHWA's responsibilities under other Federal environmental laws for most highway projects in California.

To ensure compliance by each State participating in the Pilot Program, 23 U.S.C. 327(g) requires the Secretary to conduct semiannual audits during each of the first 2 years of State participation; and annual audits during each subsequent year of State participation. The results of each audit must be presented in the form of an audit report and be made available for public

comment. This notice announces the availability of the fourth audit report for Caltrans and solicits public comment on same.

Authority: Section 6005 of Pub. L. 109-59; 23 U.S.C. 315 and 327; 49 CFR 1.48.

Issued on: December 15, 2009.

Victor M. Mendez,
Administrator.

Surface Transportation Project Delivery Pilot Program

Federal Highway Administration Audit of California Department of Transportation, July 27-31, 2009

Introduction

Overall Audit Opinion

Based on the information reviewed, it is the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) audit team's opinion that as of July 31, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has continued to make progress toward meeting all responsibilities assumed under the Surface Transportation Project Delivery Pilot Program (Pilot Program), as specified in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)¹ with FHWA and in the Caltrans Application for Assumption (Application).

With the completion of FHWA's fourth audit, Caltrans has been operating under the Pilot Program for 2 years. In compliance with the time specifications for the required audits, FHWA has completed the four semiannual audits in the first 2 years of State participation. As required under the Pilot Program, FHWA audits of Caltrans will now be on an annual basis. During the four audits conducted, the audit team has completed on-site audits at 9 of the 12 Caltrans Districts and the remaining Districts were within the scope of the Caltrans Regional Offices that were audited. The audit team continues to identify significant differences across the Districts in terms of the Pilot Program. Examples of such differences include: Resource availability and allocation; methods of implementation; processes and their improvement; and progress toward meeting all commitments. It is the audit team's opinion that the highly decentralized nature of Caltrans' operations is a major contributing factor to the variation observed. The decentralized nature of the organization necessitates clear, consistent, and ongoing oversight by Caltrans Headquarters over Districts' implementation and operation of the

¹ Caltrans MOU between FHWA and Caltrans available at: http://environment.fhwa.dot.gov/strmlng/safe_cdot_pilot.asp.