

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**Federal Aviation Administration****Agency Information Collection
Activities: Requests for Comments;
Clearance of Renewed Approval of
Information Collection: Use of Certain
Personal Oxygen Concentrator (POC)
Devices on Board Aircraft**

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, FAA invites public comments about our intention to request the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval to renew an information collection. A Special Federal Aviation Regulation requires passengers who intend to use an approved POC to present a physician statement before boarding. The flight crew must then inform the pilot-in-command that a POC is on board.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted by September 29, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathy DePaepe at (405) 954-9362, or by email at: Kathy.DePaepe@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number: 2120-0702.

Title: Use of Certain Personal Oxygen Concentrator (POC) Devices on Board Aircraft.

Form Numbers: There are no FAA forms associated with this collection.

Type of Review: Renewal of an information collection.

Background: A pilot in command is required to be apprised when a passenger brings a POC on board the aircraft, and passengers who have a medical need to use a POC during flight are required to possess a signed physician statement describing the oxygen therapy needed, to determine whether an inflight diversion to an airport may be needed in the event the passenger's POC fails to operate or the aircraft experiences cabin pressurization difficulties, and to verify the need for the device, the oxygen therapy needed to be provided by use of the POC, and the oxygen needs of the passenger in case of emergency.

Respondents: Approximately 1,690,555 passengers.

Frequency: Information is collected as needed.

Estimated Average Burden per Response: 6 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 169,046 hours.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to the FAA at the following address: Ms. Kathy DePaepe, Room 126B, Federal Aviation Administration, ASP-110, 6500 S. MacArthur Blvd., Oklahoma City, OK 73169.

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 FAA's performance; (b) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (c) ways for FAA 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.

Issued in Washington, DC, on July 28, 2014.

Albert R. Spence,

FAA Assistant Information Collection Clearance Officer, IT Enterprises Business Services Division, ASP-110.

[FR Doc. 2014-18062 Filed 7-30-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**National Highway Traffic Safety Administration****Denial of Motor Vehicle Defect Petition, DP12-003**

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

ACTION: Denial of petition for a defect investigation.

SUMMARY: This document denies a petition from Mr. Peter J. Gonzalez (the petitioner) of Fuquay Varina, NC, requesting that the agency open an investigation into headlamp failures on the model year (MY) 2008 Saturn Outlook and similar vehicles. After reviewing the petition and other information, NHTSA has concluded that further investigation of MY 2007-2009 Saturn Outlook vehicles and the similar GMC Acadia vehicles (subject vehicles) is unlikely to result in a determination that a safety-related defect exists. The agency accordingly denies the petition.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Steve Chan, Defects Assessment Division, Office of Defects Investigation, NHTSA, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: (202) 366-8537.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Alleged Problem

The petitioner alleges that his MY 2008 Saturn Outlook vehicle had experienced a loss of low beam headlamp illumination. The petitioner found that the headlamp harness mating to the headlamp had melted. He also noted that there were other complaints on NHTSA's Web site related to the same melting of the headlamp harness.

Loss of Headlamp Illumination

The United States Code for Motor Vehicle Safety (Title 49, Chapter 301) defines motor vehicle safety as "the performance of a motor vehicle or motor vehicle equipment in a way that protects the public against unreasonable risk of accidents occurring because of the design, construction, or performance of a motor vehicle, and against unreasonable risk of death or injury in an accident, and includes nonoperational safety of a motor vehicle."

Over the last 25 years, ODI has opened numerous defect investigations of the loss of headlamp illumination. Investigations that resulted in safety recalls involved simultaneous loss of illumination from both headlamps. NHTSA does not consider the loss of a single headlamp as presenting an unreasonable safety risk—such failures are readily detectable by the driver while allowing the vehicle to retain forward visibility and conspicuity from the remaining headlamp. There is typically enough time between the failure of the first headlamp and the second during which the vehicle operator can obtain the needed repairs.

Subject Vehicle Complaints

As of July 16, 2014, out of a population of 248,453 subject vehicles, NHTSA identified 473 consumer complaints of inoperative headlamp(s). Many of these complaints indicated that the headlamp harness suffered damage from overheating. After reviewing the complaints, ODI found:

- 69% (328) Alleged that a single headlamp was inoperative.
- 18% (86) alleged that both headlamps were inoperative but not at the same time.
- 9% (41) alleged that both headlamps were inoperative but the complaints did not indicate whether the failures had occurred at the same time.
- 4% (17) alleged that both headlamps were inoperative at the same time.
- One additional complaint cited wire harness damage to both sides but did not specify an outage.
- No crashes or loss of vehicle control were reported.