

extending the exemption for each renewal applicant for a period of two years is likely to achieve a level of safety equal to that existing without the exemption.

Request for Comments

FMCSA will review comments received at any time concerning a particular driver's safety record and determine if the continuation of the exemption is consistent with the requirements at 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315. However, FMCSA requests that interested parties with specific data concerning the safety records of these drivers submit comments by September 19, 2013.

FMCSA believes that the requirements for a renewal of an exemption under 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315 can be satisfied by initially granting the renewal and then requesting and evaluating, if needed, subsequent comments submitted by interested parties. As indicated above, the Agency previously published notices of final disposition announcing its decision to exempt these 16 individuals from the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). The final decision to grant an exemption to each of these individuals was made on the merits of each case and made only after careful consideration of the comments received to its notices of applications. The notices of applications stated in detail the qualifications, experience, and medical condition of each applicant for an exemption from the vision requirements. That information is available by consulting the above cited **Federal Register** publications.

Interested parties or organizations possessing information that would otherwise show that any, or all, of these drivers are not currently achieving the statutory level of safety should immediately notify FMCSA. The Agency will evaluate any adverse evidence submitted and, if safety is being compromised or if continuation of the exemption would not be consistent with the goals and objectives of 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, FMCSA will take immediate steps to revoke the exemption of a driver.

Submitting Comments

You may submit your comments and material online or by fax, mail, or hand delivery, but please use only one of these means. FMCSA recommends that you include your name and a mailing address, an email address, or a phone number in the body of your document so that FMCSA can contact you if there are questions regarding your submission.

To submit your comment online, go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and in the search box insert the docket numbers FMCSA-2001-9258; FMCSA-2007-27515; FMCSA-2009-0121; FMCSA-2010-0354; FMCSA-2010-0413 and click the search button. When the new screen appears, click on the blue "Comment Now!" button on the right hand side of the page. On the new page, enter information required including the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation. If you submit your comments by mail or hand delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you submit comments by mail and would like to know that they reached the facility, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope.

We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period and may change this proposed rule based on your comments. FMCSA may issue a final rule at any time after the close of the comment period.

Viewing Comments and Documents

To view comments, as well as any documents mentioned in this preamble, To submit your comment online, go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and in the search box insert the docket number FMCSA-2001-9258; FMCSA-2007-27515; FMCSA-2009-0121; FMCSA-2010-0354; FMCSA-2010-0413 and click "Search." Next, click "Open Docket Folder" and you will find all documents and comments related to the proposed rulemaking.

Issued on: August 9, 2013.

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2013-20333 Filed 8-19-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-EX-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2012-0111; Notice 2]

Michelin North America, Inc., Moot of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of petition mootness.

SUMMARY: Michelin North America, Inc. (Michelin),¹ has determined that certain BF Goodrich brand tires manufactured between June 12, 2011 and April 21, 2012, do not fully comply with paragraph S5.5(b) of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 139, *New Pneumatic Radial Tires for Light Vehicles*. Michelin has filed an appropriate report dated July 16, 2012, pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports*.

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) (see implementing rule at 49 CFR part 556), Michelin 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 Michelin's petition was published, with a 30-day public comment period, on February 11, 2013, in the **Federal Register** (78 FR 9774). One comment was received from the Michelin stating that after further research it believes that it filed the petition in error because the described condition is not a noncompliance. To view the petition and all supporting documents log onto the Federal Docket Management System Web site at: <http://www.regulations.gov/>. Then follow the online search instructions to locate docket number "NHTSA-2012-0111."

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information on this decision, contact Mr. Abraham Diaz, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), telephone (202) 366-5310, facsimile (202) 366-7002.

Tires Involved: Affected are approximately 1,300 g-Force Sport Comp2, size 205/45ZR17 88W, BF Goodrich brand tires manufactured between June 12, 2011 and April 21, 2012.

Noncompliance: Michelin originally explained that the noncompliance is that, due to a mold labeling error, the subject tires sidewall markings on the opposite side of the full DOT TIN are lacking the designation "Extra Load" and thus do not conform to the requirements of 49 CFR 571.139 paragraph S5.5(b).

Rule Text: Paragraph S5.5 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)

¹ Michelin North America, Inc. is a manufacturer of replacement equipment and is registered under the laws of the state of New York.

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 . . .

(b) The tire size designation as listed in the documents and publications specified in S4.1.1 of this standard . . .

Summary of Michelin's Analysis: Michelin's original analysis stated its belief that while the noncompliant tires lack the marking "Extra Load" on the sidewall opposite of the full DOT TIN as required by FMVSS No. 139, it is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety for the following reasons:

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

2. Associated with the designation "Extra Load" is a higher maximum load and a possible higher maximum inflation pressure. Each of the subject tires has been marked on both sidewalls with a maximum load of 560 kg (1235 lbs) which, under the ETRTO standard, corresponds to an Extra Load (or Reinforced) tire of the size 205/45ZR17 and load index of 88. The maximum inflation pressure marked beneath each maximum load is 340 kPa (50 psi), which is consistent with an Extra Load tire.

3. Per FMVSS No. 139 and ETRTO standards, the marking "Extra Load" alerts the installer to the fact that the subject tire has a higher load carrying capacity than the standard load tire of the same dimension. In the absence of the "Extra Load" mark, an installer could fit the subject tire to a vehicle which requires a standard load tire. But since the subject tire has the performance capacity of an Extra Load tire, the load requirement of the standard load fitment would be exceeded.

4. The subject tire is also a directional tire for which there is no intended outboard sidewall, that is, the preferred direction of rotation is marked on the sidewall, and when the subject tires are mounted on a vehicle, the left side tires on the vehicle will show the full DOT TIN and no Extra Load designation after the tire size. While this may cause some confusion for the operator, the marked

maximum load capacity of 560 kg (1235 lbs) will be visible on the outboard facing sidewall of all four tires, and will confirm the same maximum load capacity of each fitted tire.

5. All other sidewall markings are consistent with the requirements of FMVSS No. 139 for a passenger category tire and the non-conformity of the subject tires has no impact on the load carrying capacity of the tire on a motor vehicle, nor on motor vehicle safety.

Michelin has additionally informed NHTSA that it has corrected future production and that all other tire labeling information is correct.

In the comment that Michelin posted to the petition docket, it contends that after further research that it now believes that a noncompliance does not exist and that its petition is consequently moot. Michelin based this belief on previous statements published by NHTSA that it contends show that "extra load" is an "optional load identification" and is therefore considered as separate from the mandatory "tire size designation."

In summation, Michelin believes that its original determination that there is a noncompliance in the subject tires as described in the subject petition was in error and that its petition, to exempt it 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 was unnecessary and should be considered to be moot.

NHTSA Decision: Inconsequential noncompliance petitions filed under 49 CFR part 556 are only valid in situations where there is a noncompliance with a FMVSS. In its comment to the petition docket, Michelin explained that its petition was submitted in error and should be considered as moot.

Based on Michelin's description of the subject tire molding error NHTSA has determined that the alleged tire sidewall labeling noncompliance described in the subject petition is not a noncompliance with FMVSS No. 139 or any other applicable FMVSS because the "extra load" label is an "optional load identification" and not a mandatory "tire size designation." Therefore, this petition is moot and no further action on the petition is warranted.

Authority: (49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; Delegations of authority at CFR 1.95 and 501.8)

Issued On: August 7, 2013.

Claude H. Harris,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2013-20235 Filed 8-19-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of the Comptroller of the Currency

Agency Information Collection Activities: Revision of an Approved Information Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Treasury (OCC).

ACTION: Notice and request for comment.

SUMMARY: The OCC, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on a revision to this information collection, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a respondent is not required to respond to, an information collection unless it displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. Currently, the OCC is soliciting comment concerning a revision to a regulatory reporting requirement for national banks and Federal savings associations titled, "Company-Run Annual Stress Test Reporting Template and Documentation for Covered Institutions with Total Consolidated Assets of \$50 Billion or More under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act."

DATES: Comments must be received by October 21, 2013.

ADDRESSES: Communications Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Mailstop 2-3, Attention: 1557-0311, 400 7th St. SW., Washington, DC 20219. In addition, comments may be sent by fax to (202) 874-5274 or by electronic mail to regs.comments@occ.treas.gov. You may personally inspect and photocopy comments at the OCC, 400 7th St. SW., Washington, DC 20219. For security reasons, the OCC requires that visitors make an appointment to inspect comments. You may do so by calling (202) 874-4700. Upon arrival, visitors will be required to present valid government-issued photo identification and to submit to security screening in order to inspect and photocopy comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: You can request additional information from Johnny Vilela or Mary H. Gottlieb, OCC Clearance Officers, (202) 649-5490, Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, 400 7th St. SW., Washington, DC 20219. In addition, copies of the templates referenced in this notice can be found on the OCC's