FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Direct requests for additional information regarding the collection listed in this notice, including requests for copies of the proposed collection instrument and supporting documents, to Taylor Mauck, who may be reached at 202–485–7635 or at PRA_BurdenComments@state.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
- Title of Information Collection: Contact Information and Work History for Nonimmigrant Visa Applicant.
- OMB Control Number: 1405–0144.
- Type of Request: Extension of a Currently Approved Collection.
- Originating Office: CA/VO/L/R.
- Form Number: DS–0158.
- Respondents: Nonimmigrant Visa Applicants.
- Estimated Number of Respondents: 2,000.
- Estimated Number of Responses: 2,000.
- Average Time per Response: 1 hour.
- Total Estimated Burden Time: 2,000.
- Frequency: One time per visa application.
- Obligation to Respond: Required to Obtain or Retain a Benefit.

We are soliciting public comments to permit the Department to:
- Evaluate whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper functions of the Department.
- Evaluate the accuracy of our estimate of the time and cost burden for this proposed collection, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used.
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected.
- Minimize the reporting burden on those who are to respond, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Please note that comments submitted in response to this Notice are public record. Before including any detailed personal information, you should be aware that your comments as submitted, including your personal information, will be available for public review.

Abstract of proposed collection: This paper form collects contact information, current employment information, and previous work experience information from aliens applying for nonimmigrant visas to enter the United States. The information collected is necessary to determine eligibility for certain visa classifications.

Methodology: Applicants may fill out the DS–158 online or print the page and fill it out by hand and submit it in person at the time of interview.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration
Sunshine Act Meetings; Unified Carrier Registration Plan Board of Directors
AGENCY: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), DOT.
ACTION: Notice of Unified Carrier Registration Plan Board of Directors Meeting.

TIME AND DATE: The meeting will be held on November 19, 2015, from 12:00 Noon to 3:00 p.m., Eastern Standard Time.
PLACE: This meeting will be open to the public via conference call. Any interested person may call 1–877–422–1931, passcode 2855443940, to listen and participate in this meeting.
STATUS: Open to the public.
MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: The Unified Carrier Registration Plan Board of Directors (the Board) will continue its work in developing and implementing the Unified Carrier Registration Plan and Agreement and to that end, may consider matters properly before the Board.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Avelino Gutierrez, Chair, Unified Carrier Registration Board of Directors at (505) 827–4565.

Issued on: October 21, 2015.
Larry W. Minor, Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
[Docket No. NHTSA–2015–0061]
Reports, Forms, and Recordkeeping Requirements: Agency Information Collection Activity
ACTION: Request for public comment on a proposed collection of information
SUMMARY: Before a Federal agency can collect certain information from the public, it must receive approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Under procedures established by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before seeking OMB approval, Federal agencies must solicit public comment on proposed collections of information, including extensions and reinstatements of previously approved collections. This document describes one collection of information for which NHTSA intends to seek OMB approval.
DATES: Written comments should be submitted by December 28, 2015.
ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by Docket No. NHTSA–2015–0061 through one of the following methods:
- Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.
- Mail or Hand Delivery: Docket Management Facility, US Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590 between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Telephone: 202–366–9826.
- Instructions: All submission must include the agency name and docket number for this proposed collection of information. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to http://www.regulation.gov, including any personal information provided. Please see the Privacy heading below.
Privacy Act: Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT’s complete Privacy Act Statement in the Federal Register published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477–78) or you may visit http://www.dot.gov/privacy.html.
Docket: For access to the docket to read comments received, go to http://www.regulations.gov, or the street address listed above. Follow the online instructions for accessing the dockets.
FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For access to background documents, contact Ritchie Huang, Office of Crash Avoidance and Electronic Controls, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590; email: ritchie.huang@dot.gov; telephone: 202–366–5586.
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before an agency submits a proposed...
collection of information to OMB for approval, it must first publish a document in the Federal Register providing a 60-day comment period and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information. The OMB has promulgated regulations describing what must be included in such a document. Under OMB’s regulation (at 5 CFR 1320.8(d)), an agency must ask for public comment on the following:

(i) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(ii) The accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(iii) How to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected;

(iv) How to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

In compliance with these requirements, NHTSA asks for public comments on the following proposed collection of information for which the agency is seeking approval from OMB:

OMB Control Number: Not assigned.

Title: Heavy Vehicle Collision Warning Interfaces

Form Numbers: None.

Type of Review: New Information Collection

Background: Crash warning systems (CWSs) for commercial motor vehicles have been available for more than 20 years. CWSs can include features such as forward collision and lane departure warnings and use a variety of sensor technologies (e.g., radar) to determine the crash risk of a collision. CWSs are designed to warn the driver to take action to avoid or mitigate a potential crash.

CWSs are available as both options from OEMs and as aftermarket/retrofit devices. While there are certain similarities between offerings within a particular CWS product class (e.g., forward collision warning (FCW)), there are also differences in how suppliers present collision warnings, including the design of visual displays and auditory alerts. Typically, suppliers will use a combination of visual and audio modalities to convey a potential crash situation to the driver. However, their implementations vary across factors such as the visual interface, auditory alert, and the salience of alerts. While CWS implementations change and evolve, it is likely that certain warning interfaces are more effective than others during crash-imminent situations. This research seeks to examine the impact of CWSs as they pertain to commercial motor vehicle safety. The primary goal of this effort is to evaluate CWSs and assess the effectiveness of these driver-vehicle interfaces for heavy trucks and motorcoaches.

Description of the Need for the Information and Proposed Use of the Information: The collection of information consists of: (1) An eligibility questionnaire, (2) a demographic questionnaire, (3) mid study questionnaires, and (4) post study questionnaire.

The information to be collected will be used to:

- Eligibility questionnaire(s) will be used to obtain self-reported eligibility information participants must meet to qualify for participation in this study (e.g., must hold valid Class A driver’s license to drive a tractor-trailer).
- Demographic questionnaire will be used to obtain demographic information to confirm that the study group includes participants from various groups (e.g., age, gender). Other demographic information will be collected to describe the study sample (e.g., heavy vehicle operation type and classification).
- Mid-study questionnaires will be used to get information about drivers’ beliefs and attitude towards different driver distractions and their willingness to perform these types of distractions in their own vehicle. These questionnaires also serve the purpose of setting up the true surprise event which is targeted to elicit a natural response from the driver during a crash warning. Each driver will complete three mid study questionnaires, one after experiencing each task.
- Post study questionnaire(s) will be used to get information about drivers’ beliefs and attitude towards the visual and auditory alerts used in the technology tested, and to identify potential problems associated with each system. These questionnaires will also be used to assess perceived distraction potential of the systems as well as its usefulness. Each driver will complete a post study questionnaire once, after experiencing the surprise event.

Respondents: Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee drivers with a valid Class A commercial driver license.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 50 to 60.

Estimated Number of Responses: Eligibility screening will consist of one response containing 26 questions per respondent. Full participation in the study will include a demographics questionnaire containing seven questions per participant, three mid-study questionnaires each containing three questions per participant, and the post questionnaire containing 12 questions per participant.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 37 minutes per respondent (44 hours total).

Estimated Frequency: Onetime for the eligibility, post study, and demographic questionnaire; three times for the mid study questionnaire.

### Table 1—Estimated Burden Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Number of respondents ¹</th>
<th>Frequency of responses</th>
<th>Number of questions</th>
<th>Estimated individual burden (minutes)</th>
<th>Total estimated burden hours</th>
<th>Total annualize cost to respondents ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility questionnaire</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$414.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic questionnaire</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-study questionnaires</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>244.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post study questionnaire</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>366.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44 hours</td>
<td>1,073.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The number of respondents in this table includes drop-out rates.

Public Comments Invited: You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the Department’s performance; (b) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (c) ways for the Department to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collection; and (d) ways that the burden could be minimized without reducing the quality of the collected information. The agency will summarize and/or include your comments in the request for OMB’s clearance of this information collection.


Nathaniel Beuse, Associate Administrator for Vehicle Safety Research.

[FR Doc. 2015–27480 Filed 10–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2015–0052; Notice 2]

Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

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

ACTION: Grant of petition.

SUMMARY: Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company (Goodyear), has determined that certain Goodyear G316 LHT commercial truck trailer tires do not fully comply with paragraph S6.5(f) of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 119, New Pneumatic Radial Tires for motor vehicles with a GVWR of more than 4,536 Kilograms (10,000 pounds) and Motorcycles. Goodyear has filed an appropriate report dated April 27, 2015, pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports.

ADDRESSES: For further information on this decision contact Abraham Diaz, Office of Vehicles Safety Compliance, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), telephone (202) 366–5310, facsimile (202) 366–5030.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Overview: Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) (see implementing rule at 49 CFR part 556), Goodyear 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.

Notice of receipt of the Goodyear’s petition was published, with a 30-day public comment period, on June 11, 2015 in the Federal Register (80 FR 33336). No comments were received. To view the petition and all supporting documents log onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Web site at: http://www.regsulations.gov/. Then follow the online search instructions to locate docket number “NHTSA–2015–0052.”

II. Tires Involved: Affected are approximately 79 Goodyear G316 LHT size 295/75R22.5 LRG commercial truck trailer tires manufactured between March 22, 2015 and April 9, 2015.

III. Noncompliance: Goodyear explains that because the sidewall markings on the reference side of the subject tires incorrectly identify the number of plies as “4 Plies Steel Cord” instead of the actual number “5 Plies Steel Cord,” the tires do not meet the requirements of paragraph S6.5(f) of FMVSS No. 119.

IV. Rule Text: Paragraph S6.5 of FMVSS No. 119 requires in pertinent part:

S6.5 Tire markings. Except as specified in this paragraph, each tire shall be marked on each sidewall with the information specified in paragraphs (a) through (j) of this section. . .

(i) The actual number of plies and the composition of the ply cord material in the sidewall and, if different, in the tread area; . . .

V. Summary of Goodyear’s Arguments: Goodyear stated its belief that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety for the following reasons:

(A) Goodyear stated that the subject tires were manufactured as designed and meet or exceed all applicable FMVSS performance standards.

(B) Goodyear also stated that all of the sidewall markings related to tire service (load capacity, corresponding inflation pressure, etc.) are correct.

(C) Goodyear believes that the mislabeling of the subject tires is not a safety concern and also has no impact on the retreading, repairing, and recycling industries.

(D) Goodyear also pointed out that NHTSA has previously granted petitions for non-compliances in sidewall marking that it believes are similar to the subject noncompliance.

Goodyear additionally informed NHTSA that the molds at the manufacturing plant have been corrected so that no additional tires will be manufactured or sold with the noncompliance.

In summation, Goodyear believes that the described noncompliance of the subject tires is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that its petition, to exempt Goodyear 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: Although tire construction affects a tire’s 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. Tire dealers and customers must therefore consider the tire construction information along with other information such as load capacity, maximum inflation pressure, and tread wear, temperature, and traction ratings, to assess performance capabilities of various tires.

Therefore, the agency agrees with Goodyear’s statement that the incorrect markings in this case do not present a safety concern. There is no effect of the noncompliance on the operational safety of vehicles on which these tires are mounted. In the agency’s judgement, the incorrect labeling of the tire construction information in this instance will have an inconsequential effect on motor vehicle safety because most consumers do not base tire purchases or vehicle operation parameters on the number of tire plies. In addition, all of the sidewall markings related to tire service, such as load capacity and corresponding inflation pressure, are correct.

Goodyear has also indicated that it has corrected the stamping problem that caused the noncompliance. NHTSA’s Decision: In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that Goodyear has met its burden of persuasion that the noncompliance described is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, Goodyear’s petition is hereby granted and Goodyear is exempted from the obligation of providing notification of, and remedy for the subject noncompliance.

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,