

17. Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), 42 U.S.C. 300f–300j–6.

18. Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, 33 U.S.C. 401–406.

19. Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, 16 U.S.C. 1271–1287.

20. Emergency Wetlands Resources Act, 16 U.S.C. 3921–3931.

21. TEA–21 Wetlands Mitigation, 23 U.S.C. 103(b)(6)(m), 133 (b)(11).

22. Flood Disaster Protection Act, 42 U.S.C. 4001–4128.

23. Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), 16 U.S.C. 4601–4604 (known as section 6(f)).

24. Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. 9601–9675.

25. Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA).

26. Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), 42 U.S.C. 6901–6992k.

27. Landscaping and Scenic Enhancement (Wildflowers), 23 U.S.C. 319.

28. Executive Orders Relating to Highway Projects (E.O. 11990, Protection of Wetlands; E.O. 11988, Floodplain Management; E.O. 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations; E.O. 11593, Protection and Enhancement of Cultural Resources; E.O. 13007, Indian Sacred Sites; E.O. 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments; E.O. 13112, Invasive Species).

The MOU allows the State to act in the place of the FHWA in carrying out the functions described above, except with respect to government-to-government consultations with federally recognized Indian tribes. The FHWA will retain responsibility for conducting formal government-to-government consultation with federally recognized Indian tribes, which is required under some of the above-listed laws and executive orders. The State also may assist the FHWA with formal consultations, with consent of a tribe, but the FHWA remains responsible for the consultation. This assignment includes transfer to the State of Utah the obligation to fulfill the assigned environmental responsibilities on any proposed projects meeting the Criteria in Stipulation I(B) of the MOU that were determined to be CEs prior to the effective date of the proposed MOU but that have not been completed as of the effective date of the MOU.

A copy of the proposed MOU may be viewed on the DOT DMS Docket, as described above, or may be obtained by contacting the FHWA or the State at the addresses provided above. A copy may

also be viewed online at the following URL: <http://www.udot.utah.gov/go/environmental>. Once the FHWA makes a decision on the proposed MOU, the FHWA will place in the DOT DMS Docket, a statement describing the outcome of the decision-making process and a copy of the final MOU, if any. Copies of the final documents also may be obtained by contacting the FHWA or the State at the addresses provided above, or by viewing the documents at <http://www.udot.utah.gov/go/environmental>.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)

**Authority:** 23 U.S.C. 326; 42 U.S.C. 4331, 4332; 23 CFR 771.117; 40 CFR 1507.3, 1508.4.

Issued on: May 21, 2014.

**Jennifer A. Outhouse**,  
*Federal Register Liaison, Federal Highway Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2014–12271 Filed 5–27–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–22–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

#### Reports, Forms, and Record Keeping Requirements

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstract regarding the Petitions for Exemption from the Theft Prevention Standard below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The ICR describes the nature of the information collections and their expected burden. The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period was published on March 21, 2014 (79 FR 15799). The agency received no comments.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before June 27, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments, within 30 days, to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention NHTSA Desk Officer.

*Comments are invited on:* Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility; the accuracy of the Departments' estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Comments to OMB are most effective if OMB receives them within 30 days of publication.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Carlita Ballard at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Office of International Policy, Fuel Economy and Consumer Programs (NVS–131), 1200 New Jersey Ave. SE., West Building, Room W43–439, NVS–131, Washington, DC 20590. Ms. Ballard's telephone number is (202) 366–5222. Please identify the relevant collection of information by referring to its OMB Control Number.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

*Title:* Petitions for Exemption from the Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard (49 CFR Part 543)

*OMB Control Number:* 2127–0542

*Type of Request:* Request for public comment on a previously approved collection of information.

*Abstract:* Manufacturers of passenger vehicle lines may petition the agency for an exemption from Part 541 requirements, if the line is equipped with an anti-theft device as standard equipment and meets agency criteria. Device must be as effective as parts-marking. 49 U.S.C. Chapter 331 requires the Secretary of Transportation to promulgate a theft prevention standard to provide for the identification of certain motor vehicles and their major replacement parts to impede motor vehicle theft. 49 U.S.C. 33106 provides for an exemption to this identification process by petitions from manufacturers who equip covered vehicles with standard original equipment antitheft devices, which the Secretary determines are likely to be as effective in reducing or deterring theft as parts-marking. NHTSA may exempt a vehicle line from the parts marking requirement, if the manufacturer installs an antitheft device as standard equipment on the entire vehicle line for which it seeks an exemption and NHTSA determines that

the antitheft device is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements. In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 33106, after model year (MY) 2000, the number of new exemptions is contingent on a finding by the Attorney General as part of its long-range review of effectiveness. After consulting with DOJ, the agency decided it could continue granting one exemption per model year pending the results of the long-term review.

In a final rule published on April 6, 2004, the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard was extended to include all passenger cars and multipurpose passenger vehicles with a gross vehicle rating of 6,000 pounds or less, and to light duty trucks with major parts that are interchangeable with a majority of the covered major parts of multipurpose passenger vehicles. Consistent with the DOJ consultation, the April 6, 2004 final rule amended the general requirements of Section 543.5 of Chapter 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, allowing a manufacturer to petition NHTSA to grant an exemption for one additional line of its passenger motor vehicles from the requirements of the theft prevention standard for each model year after MY 1996. The final rule became effective September 1, 2006.

Prior to September 1, 2006, manufacturers were only allowed to petition NHTSA for high-theft vehicles lines. In its April 6, 2004 final rule, the agency amended part 543 to allow vehicle manufacturers to file petitions to exempt all vehicle lines that would become subject to parts-marking requirements beginning with the effective date of the final rule. As a result of this amendment, vehicle manufacturers are allowed to file petitions to exempt all vehicle lines that would become subject to the parts-marking requirements regardless of their theft status (high or low).

There are approximately 21 vehicle manufacturers that could request an exemption (one exemption per manufacturer per model year), although 33 petitions for exemption from the parts-marking requirements were received by the agency for MYs 2013–2015. This is an average of approximately 11 responses per year. NHTSA anticipates that this will remain the average number of yearly responses that will be received by the agency.

NHTSA estimates that the average hours per submittal will be 166, for a total annual burden of 1,826 hours. This is a slight increase from the previous OMB inventory of 1,808 hours. NHTSA estimates that the cost associated with

the burden hours is \$39.49 per hour, for a total cost of approximately \$72,109.

*Affected Public:* Motor vehicle manufacturers.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden:* NHTSA estimates that vehicle manufacturers will incur a total annual reporting hour and cost burden of 1,826 hours and \$72,109 respectively. There would be no additional cost to motor vehicle manufacturers that would require it to comply to this regulation.

**Claude H. Harris,**

*Acting Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.*

[FR Doc. 2014–12306 Filed 5–27–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–59–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2013–0125; Notice 2]

#### Hankook Tire America Corp, Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

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

**ACTION:** Grant of Petition.

**SUMMARY:** Hankook Tire America Corp, (Hankook) has determined that certain model year Hankook Roadhandler Sport (H432) tires manufactured between June 21, 2013 and August 29, 2013, do not fully comply with paragraph S5.5(f) of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No.139, *New Pneumatic Radial Tires for Light Vehicles*. Hankook has filed an appropriate report dated October 4, 2013, pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports*.

**ADDRESSES:** For further information on this decision contact Abraham Diaz, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), telephone (202) 366–5310, facsimile (202) 366–5930.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*I. Hankook's Petition:* Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) (see implementing rule at 49 CFR part 556), Hankook 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 October 4, 2013, petition was published, with a 30-day public comment period, on December 10, 2013 in the **Federal**

**Register** (78 FR 74226). 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.regulations.gov/>. Then follow the online search instructions to locate docket number “NHTSA–2013–0125.”

*II. Tires Involved:* Affected are approximately 6,257 Roadhandler Sport (H432), size 215/45R17 91W XL, Hankook tires manufactured between June, 21, 2013 and August 29, 2013.

*III. Noncompliance:* Hankook explains that the noncompliance is that, due to a mold labeling error, the sidewall marking on the side of the tires incorrectly describes the actual number of plies in the tread area of the tires as required by paragraph S5.5(f) of 49 CFR 571.139. Specifically, the tires in question were inadvertently manufactured with “Ply Tread 2 steel + 1 Polyester + 2 Nylon, Sidewall 1 Polyester.” The correct labeling and stamping to match the tire construction should have been “Ply Tread 2 steel + 1 Polyester + 1 Nylon, Sidewall 1 Polyester.”

*IV. Rule Text:* Paragraph S5.5(f) of FMVSS No. 139 requires in pertinent part:

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 side-wall 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 that 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 . . .

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

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

1. The affected subject tires meet or exceed all applicable FMVSS performance standards.

2. The subject tires will not be affected based on performance, durability, or safety they are designed and build for.

Hancock has additionally informed NHTSA that it has corrected the