Q. How do I file my request?

A. You can file a request by going to FRA’s Web site (www.fra.dot.gov) and clicking on the Bridge Inspection Report link. There you will find the “Bridge Inspection Report Public Version Request Form” (FRA F 6180.167). Please complete thispdf fillable form by providing all of the information listed in the question above and click on the “submit” box when completed. This will automatically create an email that will send the completed form directly to FRA. A link to the form has also been provided at the end of these questions below.

If you are unable to submit the form to FRA directly, please fill out the “Bridge Inspection Report Public Version Request Form” (FRA F 6180.167) and attach it in an email to FRABridgeInspectionReportRequest@dot.gov. Requests will only be accepted through this email address with the proper form completely filled out and attached.

Q. How will FRA handle a request?

A. FRA will evaluate the request and, if found to be compliant with law, FRA will promptly request that the railroad responsible for the bridge provide a public version of the most recent inspection report(s) to FRA. Once FRA has received the report(s), FRA will review the report(s) to ensure that at least the minimum information required by law has been provided. Once determined to be satisfactory, the report(s) will be sent to the requester electronically by reply to the request unless the requester provides an alternate email address to send the report to.

Q. What information must a railroad include in the public version of the bridge inspection report provided to FRA?

A. The FAST Act requires the following information to be included in a public version of a bridge inspection report:

1. The date of the last inspection;
2. Length of bridge;
3. Location of bridge;
4. Type of bridge (superstructure);
5. Type of structure (substructure);
6. Features crossed by the bridge;
7. Railroad contact information; and
8. A general statement on the condition of the bridge.

Q. How much time does a railroad have to provide the public version of a bridge inspection report to FRA?

A. FRA interprets the statute to require a railroad to provide a requested report containing at least the minimum specified information within a reasonable amount of time. FRA believes that a reasonable time for a railroad to provide a requested report is within 30 days of receipt of FRA’s request.

Q. How long will it take FRA to produce a public version of a bridge inspection report to a requester?

A. FRA will handle these requests as expeditiously as possible and generally expects to respond to most requests by providing the requester with a public version of a bridge inspection report within 45 days of receipt of the request.

Attachment 1 to Frequently Asked Questions

FAST Act—SECTION 11405—BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORTS

Section 417(d) of the Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (49 U.S.C. 20103 note) is amended—(1) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following: “(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and (2) by adding at the end the following: “(2) AVAILABILITY OF BRIDGE CONDITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A State or political subdivision of a State may file a request with the Secretary for a public version of a bridge inspection report generated under subsection (b)(5) for a bridge located in such State or political subdivision’s jurisdiction.

(B) PUBLIC VERSION OF REPORT.—If the Secretary determines that the request is reasonable, the Secretary shall require a railroad to submit a public version of the most recent bridge inspection report, such as a summary form, for a bridge subject to a request under subparagraph (A). The public version of a bridge inspection report shall include the date of last inspection, length of bridge, location of bridge, type of bridge, type of structure, feature crossed by bridge, and railroad contact information, along with a general statement on the condition of the bridge.

(C) PROVISION OF REPORT.—The Secretary shall provide to a State or political subdivision of a State a public version of a bridge inspection report submitted under subparagraph (B).

(D) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary, upon the reasonable request of State or political subdivision of a State, shall provide technical assistance to such State or political subdivision of a State to facilitate the understanding of a bridge inspection report.”

BILING CODE 4910-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Petition for Exemption From the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Toyota

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

ACTION: Grant of petition for exemption.

SUMMARY: This document grants in full the Toyota Motor North America, Inc.’s (Toyota) petition for an exemption of the Lexus RX vehicle line in accordance with 49 CFR part 543, Exemption from Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard. This petition is granted because the agency has determined that the antitheft device to be placed on the 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 49 CFR part 541, Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard (Theft Prevention Standard).

DATES: The exemption granted by this notice is effective beginning with the 2017 model year (MY).


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In a petition dated December 1, 2015, Toyota requested an exemption from the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard for the Lexus RX vehicle line beginning with MY 2017. The petition requested an exemption from parts-marking 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 vehicle line.

Under 49 CFR part 543.5(a), a manufacturer may petition NHTSA to grant an exemption for one vehicle line per model year. In its petition, Toyota provided a detailed description and diagram of the identity, design, and location of the components of the antitheft device for the Lexus RX vehicle line. Toyota stated that its MY 2017 Lexus RX vehicle line and RX hybrid vehicle model (HV) will be equipped with a “smart entry and start” system and an engine immobilizer device as standard equipment. Toyota further explained that the “smart entry and start” system on its Lexus RX vehicle line will have slightly different components than those on its RX HV model. Key components of the “smart entry and start” system on the Lexus RX vehicle line will include an engine immobilizer, a certification electronic control unit (ECU), engine switch, steering lock ECU, security indicator, door control receiver, electrical key, an electronic control module (ECM) and an ID code box. The key components installed on its RX HV model will also include a power switch and a power source HV–ECU. Toyota stated that it will also install an audible and visual alarm system on its Lexus RX vehicle line as standard equipment and that there will be position switches installed on the vehicle to protect the hood and doors from unauthorized tampering/ opening. Toyota further explained locking of the doors can be accomplished through use of a conventional key, wireless switch incorporated within the keyfob or its
smart entry system, and that unauthorized tampering with the hood or door without using one of these methods will cause the position switches to trigger the alarm system.

Toyota’s submission is considered a complete petition as required by 49 CFR 543.7 in that it meets the general requirements contained in §543.5 and the specific content requirements of §543.6.

In addressing the specific content requirements of §543.6, Toyota provided information on the reliability and durability of its proposed device. To ensure reliability and durability of the device, Toyota conducted tests based on its own specified standards. Toyota provided a detailed list of the tests conducted (i.e., high and low temperature, strength, impact, vibration, electro-magnetic interference, etc.). Toyota stated that it believes that its device is reliable and durable because it complied with its own specific design standards and the antitheft device is installed on other vehicle lines for which the agency has granted a parts-marking exemption. Toyota stated that the antitheft device is already installed as standard equipment on its MY 2003 Lexus RX vehicle line and the MY 2006 RX HV model. The theft rate for the Toyota Lexus RX vehicle line using an average of three model years’ data (MYs 2011–2013) is 0.3679, which is well below the 3.5826 median thief rate. As an additional measure of reliability and durability, Toyota stated that its vehicle key cylinders are covered with casting cases to prevent the key cylinder from easily being broken. Toyota further explained that the numerous key cylinder combinations and key plates it uses for its gutter keys would make it very difficult to unlock the doors without using a valid key. If a valid key is used, the key cylinders spin out and its locks will not work.

Toyota stated that its Lexus RX vehicles’ “smart entry and start” system allows the driver to press the engine switch button located on the instrument panel to start the vehicle. Once the driver pushes the engine switch button, the certification ECU verifies the electrical key. When the key is verified, the certification ECU, ID code box and steering lock ECU receive confirmation of the valid key, and the certification ECU allows the ECM to start the vehicle.

Toyota stated that with its “smart entry and start” system, the immobilizer device is activated when the engine switch is pushed from the “ON” ignition status to any other ignition status, the certification ECU performs the calculation of the immobilizer and the immobilizer signals the ECM to activate the device. On the RX HV model, the “smart entry and start” system’s immobilizer device is activated when the power switch is pushed from the “ON” ignition status to any other ignition status, the certification ECU performs the calculation of the immobilizer and the immobilizer signals the HV–ECU to activate the device.

Deactivation of its smart key–installed systems occurs when the doors are unlocked and the device recognizes the key code. Deactivation of the conventional key system occurs when the door is unlocked and the key is turned to the “ON” position. Toyota also explained its proposed device to other devices NHTSA has determined to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements (i.e., Toyota Camry, Corolla, Prius, RAV4, Highlander, Sienna, Lexus LS, and Lexus GS vehicle lines) which have all been granted parts-marking exemptions by the agency. The theft rates for the Toyota Camry, Corolla, Prius, RAV4, Highlander, Sienna, Lexus LS, and Lexus GS vehicle lines using an average of three model years’ data (2011–2013) are 1.3030, 1.3988, 0.2464, 0.4100, 0.4603, 0.5124, 0.4879 and 0.9116 respectively. Therefore, Toyota has concluded that the antitheft device proposed for its Lexus RX vehicle line is no less effective than those devices on the lines for which NHTSA has already granted full exemption from the parts-marking requirements. Toyota stated that it believes that installing the immobilizer as standard equipment reduces the theft rate and expects the Lexus RX vehicle line to experience comparable effectiveness, and ultimately be more effective than parts-marking labels.

Based on the supporting evidence submitted by Toyota on its device, the agency believes that the antitheft device for the Lexus RX vehicle 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 Standard (49 CFR §541). The agency concludes that Toyota will provide the five types of performance listed in §543.6(a)(3): Promoting activation; attracting attention to the efforts of unauthorized persons to enter or operate a vehicle by means other than a key; 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.

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 33106 and 49 CFR 543.7(b), the agency grants a petition for exemption from the parts-marking requirements of Part 541, either in whole or in part, if it determines that, based upon substantial evidence, the standard equipment antitheft device is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of Part 541. The agency finds that Toyota has provided adequate reasons for its belief that the antitheft device for the Toyota Lexus RX vehicle 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 Standard (49 CFR part 541). This conclusion is based on the information Toyota provided about its device.

For the foregoing reasons, the agency hereby grants in full Toyota’s petition for exemption for the Toyota Lexus RX vehicle line from the parts-marking requirements of 49 CFR part 541. The agency notes that 49 CFR part 541, Appendix A–1, identifies those lines that are exempted from the Theft Prevention Standard for a given model year. 49 CFR part 543.7(f) contains publication requirements incident to the disposition of all Part 543 petitions. Advanced listing, including the release of future product nameplates, the beginning model year for which the petition is granted and a general description of the antitheft device is necessary in order to notify law enforcement agencies of new vehicle lines exempted from the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard.

If Toyota 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 parts 541.5 and 541.6 (marking of major component parts and replacement parts).

NHTSA notes that if Toyota 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, Part 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 that Part 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 the agency before preparing and submitting a petition to modify.

Issued in Washington, DC, under authority delegated in 49 CFR 1.95.

Raymond R. Posten, Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 2016–03443 Filed 2–18–16; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Regulation Project

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Treasury, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). Currently, the IRS is soliciting comments concerning Guidance Necessary To Facilitate Business Election Filing; Finalization of Controlled Group Qualification Rules (TD 9329).


REGULATION PROJECT:

Abstract: This document contains a final regulation that provides guidance to taxpayers for determining which corporations are included in a controlled group of corporations. Current Actions: There are no changes to these existing regulations.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 225,375.

Estimated Time per Respondent: 1 hour, 40 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 375,000.

The following paragraph applies to all of the collections of information covered by this notice:

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a valid OMB control number. Books or records relating to a collection of information must be retained as long as their contents may become material in the administration of any internal revenue law. Generally, tax returns and tax return information are confidential, as required by 26 U.S.C. 6103.

Request for Comments: Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and (e) estimates of capital or start-up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of services to provide information.

Approved: February 12, 2016.

Kerry Dennis, IRS Tax Analyst.

[FR Doc. 2016–03446 Filed 2–18–16; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4830–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

[OMB Control No. 2900–NEW]

Agency Information Collection (VA Financial Services Center (VA–FSC) Vendor File Request Form); Activity Under OMB Review

AGENCY: Financial Services Center, Department of Veterans Affairs.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3521), this notice announces that the Department of Veterans Affairs—Financial Services Center (VA–FSC) will submit the collection of information abstracted below to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The PRA submission describes the nature of the information collection and its expected cost and burden and includes the actual data collection instrument.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before March 21, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments on the collection of information through www.Regulations.gov, or to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attn: VA Desk Officer: 725 17th St. NW., Washington, DC 20503 or sent through electronic mail to oira_submission@omb.eop.gov. Please refer to “OMB Control No. 2900–NEW (VA–FSC Vendor File Request Form)” in any correspondence.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Crystal Rennie, Enterprise Records Service (005R1B), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20420. (202) 632–7492 or email crystal.rennie@va.gov. Please refer to “OMB Control No. 2900–NEW (VA–FSC Vendor File Request Form)” in any correspondence.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: VA–FSC Vendor File Request Form.

OMB Control Number: 2900–NEW.

Type of Review: New collection.

Abstract: The mission of the Nationwide Vendor File Division of the Department of Veterans Affairs—Financial Services Center (VA–FSC) is to add, modify, or delete vendor records