

nongovernmental organizations, think tanks and academia, providing the Secretary with a fresh perspective and insight apart from and independent of the State Department organization. It will not perform the function of any existing Department staff or committee.

For further information, please contact the Committee's Designated Federal Officer, Jim Thompson, at civilengagement@state.gov.

Dated: May 23, 2015.

James F. Thompson,

Director of Innovation, Secretary's Office of Global Partnerships, U.S. Department of State.

[FR Doc. 2015-13115 Filed 5-29-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-10-P

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice: 9156]

Notice of Meeting of Advisory Committee on International Law

A meeting of the Department of State's Advisory Committee on International Law will take place on Friday, June 26, from 9:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. at the George Washington University Law School, Michael K. Young Faculty Conference Center, 716 20th Street NW., 5th Floor, Washington, DC. Acting Legal Adviser Mary McLeod will chair the meeting, which will be open to the public up to the capacity of the conference room. The meeting will include discussions on a variety of international law topics.

Members of the public who wish to attend should contact the Office of the Legal Adviser by June 22 at thorntonnc@state.gov or 202-776-8356 and provide their name, professional affiliation, address, and phone number. A valid photo ID is required for admission to the meeting. Attendees who require reasonable accommodation should make their requests by June 19. Late requests will be considered but might not be possible to accommodate.

Dated: May 20, 2015.

Nicole C. Thornton,

Attorney-Adviser, Office of the Legal Adviser, Executive Director, Advisory Committee on International Law, United States Department of State.

[FR Doc. 2015-13114 Filed 5-29-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-08-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

[FTA Docket No. FTA-2015-0016]

Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Federal Transit Administration invites public comment about its intention to request the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) approval to extend the approval of the following information collection:

49 U.S.C. Section 5316—Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) Program

The information collected is necessary to permit an assessment of program effectiveness and ensure the proper and timely expenditure of federal funds within the scope of the program. The **Federal Register** notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments for the (JARC) Program was published on March 15, 2015 (Citation 80 FR 51). No comments were received from that notice.

DATES: Comments must be submitted before July 1, 2015. A comment to OMB is most effective if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication.

ADDRESSES: All written comments must refer to the docket number that appears at the top of this document and be submitted to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention: FTA Desk Officer.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tia Swain, Office of Administration, Office of Management Planning, (202) 366-0354.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Job Access and Reverse Commute Program
(OMB Number: 2132-0563)

Abstract: The Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) Program authorized federal funding to states for areas with a population of less than 200,000 and designated recipients in urbanized areas of 200,000 persons to address the unique transportation challenges faced by welfare recipients and low-income persons seeking to get and keep jobs. The (JARC) program has had a dramatic impact on the lives of thousands of welfare recipients and low-income families, helping individuals successfully transition from welfare to work and reach needed employment support services such as childcare and

job training activities. On October 1, 2013, the (JARC) Program was repealed by Congress under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21). However, to meet federal program oversight responsibilities, FTA must continue to collect information under the project management stage; until the period of availability expires; the funds are fully expended; the funds are rescinded by Congress; or the funds are otherwise reallocated.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 52,080 hours.

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 Department's 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.

Matthew M. Crouch,

Associate Administrator for Administration.

[FR Doc. 2015-13065 Filed 5-29-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2014-0107; Notice 2]

Continental Tire the Americas, LLC, Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

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

ACTION: Grant of petition.

SUMMARY: Continental Tire the Americas, LLC (CTA) has determined that certain Continental General Altimax RT43 replacement tires do not fully comply with paragraphs S5.5(c) and (f) of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 139, *New Pneumatic Radial Tires for Light Vehicles*. CTA has filed an appropriate report dated August 19, 2014, 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. *CTA's Petition*: Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) (see implementing rule at 49 CFR part 556), CTA 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 petition was published, with a 30-day public comment period, on November 21, 2014 in the **Federal Register** (79 FR 69554). 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–2014–0107."

II. *Tires Involved*: Affected are approximately 814 replacement tires that were manufactured for sale in the United States and Canada. CTA states that 181 of the replacement tires are still under their control. CTA further identified the tires as General Altimax RT43 brand 195/65R15 91T passenger car tires and General Altimax RT43 brand 195/65R15 91H passenger car tires.

III. *Noncompliance*: CTA explains that the noncompliance is that due to a mold labeling error the sidewall markings on both tires incorrectly describe the maximum inflation pressure as required by paragraph 5.5 (c) and the actual number plies in the tread area of the tires as required by paragraph S5.5(f) of FMVSS No. 139. Specifically, the 195/65R15 91T General Altimax RT43 tires were manufactured with "Max Inflation Pressure: 350 kPa (51 PSI); Tread: 1 Polyester + 2 Steel + 2 Polyamide." The correct labeling and stamping should have been "Max Inflation Pressure: 300 kPa (44 PSI); Tread: 1 Polyester + 2 Steel + 1 Polyamide." The 195/65R15 91H General Altimax RT43 tires were manufactured with "Max Inflation Pressure 300 kPa (44 PSI); Tread: 1 Polyester + 2 Steel + 1 Polyamide." The correct labeling and stamping should have been "Max Inflation Pressure 350 kPa (51 PSI); Tread: 1 Polyester + 2 Steel + 2 Polyamide."

IV. *Rule Text*: Paragraph S5.5(c) and (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 sidewall with the information specified in S5.5(e) through (i) according to the phase-in schedule specified in S7 of this standard . . .

(C) The maximum permissible inflation pressure, subject to the limitation of S5.5.4 through S5.5.6 of this standard;

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

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

(A) Number of Plies: CTA believes that the mislabeling of the number of plies on the subject tires has no impact on the operational performance of the subject tires or on the safety of vehicles on which these tires are to be mounted. CTA states that the subject tires also meet or exceed all of the performance requirements specified by FMVSS No. 139.

(B) Max Inflation Pressure: CTA believes that the choice of the maximum inflation pressure level is the decision of the tire manufacturer, as long as it is in compliance with the established values under FMVSS No. 139 paragraph S5.5.4. CTA also believes that the maximum inflation pressure values of 350 kPa and 300 kPa on both tires are acceptable choices and stated that both tires can accommodate a maximum pressure of 350 kPa (51 PSI).

(C) Overloading: CTA believes that the use of either of the maximum inflation pressures displayed on the subject tire sidewalls as the source of information for the recommended inflation pressure will not result in an overloading of the tires or their load carrying capacity. CTA says this is because both values (300 kPa and 350 kPa) are above the inflation pressure of 250 kPa (36 PSI) at which the tire's maximum load capacity is defined by the European Tyre and Rim Technical Organisation (ETRTO) standard.

(D) Strength: CTA stated that each standard load tire has a specified tire strength requirement which is defined in paragraph S6.5 of FMVSS No. 139 (and paragraph S5.3 of FMVSS No. 109) and must be met whether the selected maximum permissible pressure marking value is 240 kPa (35 PSI), 300 kPa (44 PSI), or 350 kPa (51 PSI). CTA believes that both of the subject tires meet this requirement.

(E) Incidents: CTA stated that they are not aware of any crashes, injuries, customer complaints, or field reports associated with the subject noncompliance.

(F) Previous Rulings: CTA made mention that NHTSA has previously

granted tire companies inconsequentiality exemptions relating to errors in sidewall markings.

CTA has additionally informed NHTSA that it has corrected the noncompliance so that all future production of the subject tires comply with FMVSS No. 139.

In summation, CTA believes that the described noncompliance of the subject tires is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that its petition, to exempt CTA 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 Decision

NHTSA Analysis: Continental explained that the subject tires, the 195/65R15 91T General Altimax RT43 and the 195/65R15 91H General Altimax RT43, do not comply with paragraph S5.5(c) FMVSS No. 139 because they were manufactured with an incorrect maximum permissible inflation pressure value. The maximum permissible inflation pressure for the 195/65R15 91T General Altimax RT43 was marked as 350 KPA (51 PSI) and the maximum permissible inflation pressure for the 195/65R15 91H General Altimax RT43 was marked as 300 KPA (44 PSI). The correct maximum permissible inflation pressure value for the 195/65R15 91T General Altimax RT43 should have been 300 KPA (44 PSI) while the correct maximum inflation pressure for the 195/65R15 91H General Altimax RT43 should have been 350 KPA (51 PSI). Continental stated that for the subject 195/65R15 standard load tires, both maximum inflation pressures of 350 KPA and 300 KPA are acceptable choices and both types of tires can safely accommodate the maximum inflation pressure of 350 KPA.

Continental stated that inflation of the tires to the incorrect maximum pressure value stamped on the sidewall will not result in overloading of their load carrying capacity since both values of 300 KPA and 350 KPA are above the inflation pressure of 250 KPA at which the tire's maximum load capacity is defined by the European Tyre and Rim Technical Organisation (ETRTO). Thus, the maximum load capacity of these tires can be obtained with the stamped pressures of 300 KPA and 350 KPA and therefore following the maximum permissible inflation pressure values on the side wall of the tires will not lead to inadvertent overloading.

NHTSA agrees that in the case of the subject tires the noncompliances with paragraph S5.5(c) of FMVSS No. 139 are inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

The mislabeling does not cause any safety problems, such as increasing the probability of tire failure, and it is unlikely to result in unsafe use of the tires.

The agency also believes that the noncompliance of the subject tires with the ply labeling requirements of paragraph S5.5(f) of FMVSS No. 139 is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety because the noncompliance does not affect the operational safety of the vehicles on which these tires are mounted. Although tire construction affects the strength and durability, information relating tire strength and durability to the number of plies and types of ply cord material in the tread and sidewall is not readily available to tire dealers and consumers. Therefore, tire dealers and consumers should 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. 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 number of plies in a tire.

NHTSA has also considered the safety of personnel working in the tire retread, repair, and recycling industries in assessing whether the noncompliance of the subject tires with paragraph S5.5(f) FMVSS No. 139 is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. The agency believes the noncompliance will have no measurable effect on the safety of 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 sidewall is marked correctly for the number of steel plies, this potential safety concern does not exist.

NHTSA Decision: In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that CTA has met its burden of persuasion that the FMVSS No. 139 noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, CTA's petition is hereby granted and CTA is exempted from the obligation of providing notification of, and a remedy for, that 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 noncompliant tires that CTA no longer controlled at the time it determined that the noncompliance existed. However, the granting of this petition does not relieve equipment 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 CTA 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. 2015-13109 Filed 5-29-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[Docket No. AB 290 (Sub-No. 377X)];
[Docket No. AB 1231X]

Norfolk Southern Railway Company— Discontinuance of Service Exemption—in Lucas County, Ohio; Midwest Rail, LLC d/b/a/Toledo, Lake Erie and Western Railway— Discontinuance of Service Exemption—in Lucas County, Ohio

Norfolk Southern Railway Company (NSR) and Midwest Rail, LLC d/b/a Toledo, Lake Erie and Western Railway (TLEW) (collectively, applicants) have jointly filed a verified notice of exemption under 49 CFR part 1152 subpart F—*Exempt Abandonments and Discontinuances of Service* for NSR to discontinue rail service, and for TLEW to discontinue lease operations, over approximately 1.80-miles of rail line owned by NSR between milepost TS 13.2 near Maumee, to milepost TS 15.0 at Waterville, in Lucas County, Ohio (the Line). Applicants state that TLEW originally obtained authority to operate the Line in 2012;¹ however, TLEW did not conduct any business on the Line and eventually defaulted on the lease. Thereafter, NSR cancelled the lease pursuant to the terms of the parties' contract, and NSR has been given power of attorney to file for discontinuance of TLEW's lease operations on TLEW's

behalf. The Line traverses United States Postal Service Zip Codes 43537 and 43566.

Applicants have certified that: (1) No local traffic has moved over the Line for at least two years; (2) no overhead traffic has moved over the Line for at least two years and overhead traffic, if any, could be rerouted over other lines; (3) no formal complaint filed by a user of rail service on the Line (or by a state or local government entity acting on behalf of such user) regarding cessation of service over the Line either is pending with the Surface Transportation Board or with any U.S. District Court or has been decided in favor of complainant within the two-year period; and (4) the requirements at 49 CFR 1105.12 (newspaper publication) and 49 CFR 1152.50(d)(1) (notice to governmental agencies) have been met.

As a condition to these exemptions, any employee adversely affected by the discontinuance of service shall be protected under *Oregon Short Line Railroad—Abandonment Portion Goshen Branch Between Firth & Ammon, in Bingham & Bonneville Counties, Idaho*, 360 I.C.C. 91 (1979). To address whether this condition adequately protects affected employees, a petition for partial revocation under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) must be filed.

Provided no formal expression of intent to file an offer of financial assistance (OFA) to subsidize continued rail service has been received, these exemptions will be effective on July 1, 2015, unless stayed pending reconsideration. Petitions to stay that do not involve environmental issues and formal expressions of intent to file an OFA to subsidize continued rail service under 49 CFR 1152.27(c)(2)² must be filed by June 11, 2015.³ Petitions to reopen must be filed by June 22, 2015, with the Surface Transportation Board, 395 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20423-0001.

A copy of any petition filed with the Board should be sent to applicants' representative: William A. Mullins, Baker & Miller PLLC, 2401 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Suite 300, Washington, DC 20037.

If the notice contains false or misleading information, these exemptions are void *ab initio*.

Board decisions and notices are available on our Web site at "www.stb.dot.gov."

² Each OFA must be accompanied by the filing fee, which is currently set at \$1,600. See 49 CFR 1002.2(f)(25).

³ Because applicants are seeking to discontinue service, not to abandon the Line, trail use/rail banking and public use conditions are not appropriate.

¹ *Midwest Rail, LLC d/b/a Toledo, Lake Erie & W. Ry.—Lease & Operation Exemption—Norfolk S. Ry.*, FD 35634 (STB served June 29, 2012).