

comments received, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, and follow the online instructions for accessing the dockets, or go to the street address listed above.

Privacy Act: Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement for the Federal Docket Management System published in the **Federal Register** on January 17, 2008 (73 FR 3316), or you may visit <http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2008/pdf/E8-794.pdf>.

Public Participation: The Federal eRulemaking Portal is available 24 hours each day, 365 days each year. You can obtain electronic submission and retrieval help and guidelines under the "help" section of the Federal eRulemaking Portal website. If you want us to notify you that we received your comments, please include a self-addressed, stamped envelope or postcard, or print the acknowledgement page that appears after submitting comments online. Comments received after the comment closing date will be included in the docket and will be considered to the extent practicable.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Suzanne Rach, Office of Enforcement and Compliance, Hazardous Materials Division, Department of Transportation, FMCSA, West Building 6th Floor, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: 202-385-2307; email suzanne.rach@dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background: The Secretary of Transportation (Secretary) is responsible for implementing regulations to issue safety permits for transporting certain HM in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 5101 *et seq.* Currently, the HM Safety Permit regulations (49 CFR part 385, subpart E) require companies applying for a HM Safety Permit that do not have a USDOT number to file online at the FMCSA website via the Unified Registration System (URS) before conducting operations in commerce that require a safety permit. Safety permit applications for companies that have a USDOT number and applications to update or renew a safety permit must be filed with FMCSA using the form MCS-150B (Combined Motor Carrier Identification Report and HMSP Application). The URS and MCS-150B are covered under the FMCSA's OMB Control Number 2126-0013, "Motor Carrier Identification Report," information

collection request. The FMCSA requires companies holding permits to develop a communications plan that allows for the periodic tracking of the shipment. This information collection request covers the record of communications that includes the name of the driver, identification of the vehicle, permitted material(s) being transported, and the date, location and time of each contact. The records may be kept by either the driver (e.g., recorded in the log book) or the company. These records must be kept, either physically or electronically, for at least six months at the company's principal place of business or be readily available to employees at the company's principal place of business.

Title: Hazardous Materials Safety Permits.

OMB Control Number: 2126-0030.

Type of Request: Revision and extension of a currently-approved information collection.

Respondents: Motor carriers subject to the Hazardous Materials Safety Permit requirements in 49 CFR part 385, subpart E.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 987.

Estimated Time per Response: 5 minutes. The communication between motor carriers and their drivers must take place at least two times per day, and at the pickup and delivery of each permitted load. It is estimated that it will take 5 minutes to maintain a daily communication record for each driver.

Expiration Date: August 31, 2020.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 692,000 hours [8.3 million trips × 5 minutes per record ÷ 60 minutes per hour = 691,667 rounded to 692,000]

Public Comments Invited: You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including: (1) Whether the proposed collection is necessary for the performance of FMCSA's functions; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways for FMCSA to enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the collected information; and (4) ways that the burden could be minimized without reducing the quality of the collected information. The agency will summarize or include your comments in the request for OMB's clearance of this information collection.

Issued under the authority of 49 CFR 1.87 on: October 31, 2019.

Kelly Regal,

Associate Administrator for Office of Research and Information Technology.

[FR Doc. 2019-24236 Filed 11-6-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-EX-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2019-0064; Notice 1]

Toyota Motor North America, Inc., Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

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

ACTION: Receipt of petition.

SUMMARY: Toyota Motor North America, Inc., (Toyota) has determined that certain model year (MY) 2013-2019 Lexus motor vehicles do not fully comply with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 108, *Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment*. Toyota filed a noncompliance report dated May 30, 2019. Toyota subsequently petitioned NHTSA on June 21, 2019, for a decision that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety. This document announces receipt of Toyota's petition.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the petition is December 9, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on this petition. Comments must refer to the docket number cited in the title of this notice and may be submitted by any of the following methods:

- **Mail:** Send comments by mail addressed to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.

- **Hand Delivery:** Deliver comments by hand to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. except for Federal Holidays.

- **Electronically:** Submit comments electronically by logging onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) website at <https://www.regulations.gov/>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

- Comments may also be faxed to (202) 493-2251.

Comments must be written in the English language, and be no greater than 15 pages in length, although there is no limit to the length of necessary attachments to the comments. If comments are submitted in hard copy

form, please ensure that two copies are provided. If you wish to receive confirmation that comments you have submitted by mail were received, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard with the comments. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to <https://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided.

All comments and supporting materials received before the close of business on the closing date indicated above will be filed in the docket and will be considered. All comments and supporting materials received after the closing date will also be filed and will be considered to the fullest extent possible.

When the petition is granted or denied, notice of the decision will also be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated at the end of this notice.

All comments, background documentation, and supporting materials submitted to the docket may be viewed by anyone at the address and times given above. The documents may also be viewed on the internet at <https://www.regulations.gov> by following the online instructions for accessing the dockets. The docket ID number for this petition is shown in the heading of this notice.

DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement is available for review in a **Federal Register** notice published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477–78).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. *Overview*: Toyota has determined that certain MY 2013–2019 Lexus motor vehicles do not fully comply with paragraph S8.1.11 and Table XVI-a of FMVSS No. 108, *Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment* (49 CFR 571.108). Toyota filed a noncompliance report for the motor vehicles dated May 30, 2019, pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports*. Toyota subsequently petitioned NHTSA on June 21, 2019, for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) and 49 CFR part 556, *Exemption for Inconsequential Defect or Noncompliance*.

This notice of receipt, of Toyota's petition, is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercises of judgment concerning the merits of the petition.

II. *Vehicles Involved*: Approximately 502,034 of the following MY 2013–2019 Lexus motor vehicles, manufactured between July 19, 2011, and May 21, 2019, are potentially involved:

- MY 2013–2018 Lexus ES350
- MY 2013–2018 Lexus ES300h
- MY 2013–2019 Lexus GS200t/300/350
- MY 2013–2018 Lexus GS450h
- MY 2016–2019 Lexus GS–F

III. *Noncompliance*: Toyota explains that the noncompliance is that the subject vehicles are equipped with rear reflectors that do not meet the minimum photometry requirements specified in paragraph S8.1.11 and Table XVI-a of FMVSS No. 108. Specifically, the reflex reflector in the subject vehicles may contain a photometry value 18 percent below the required minimum.

IV. *Rule Requirements*: Paragraph S8.1.11 and Table XVI-a of FMVSS No. 108 includes the requirements relevant to this petition. Each reflex reflector must be designed to conform to the photometry requirements of Table XVI-a, when tested according to the procedure in paragraph S14.2.3 of FMVSS No. 108, for the reflex reflector color.

V. *Summary of Toyota's Petition*: The following views and arguments presented in this section, V. Summary of Toyota's petition, are the views and arguments provided by Toyota. They have not been evaluated by the agency and do not reflect the views of the agency.

Toyota described the subject noncompliance and stated that the noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety. Toyota submitted the following views and arguments in support of the petition:

1. The extent of the noncompliance for the subject reflex reflectors is such that the human eye is unable to differentiate the reflected light of noncompliant reflectors from the reflected light of ones that are compliant.

The technical cause of the noncompliance is related to the annealing process at the end of a day when reflectors were left in the oven as the oven cooled down. An assessment was made of the maximum deviation from the standard that could result from this circumstance. Based on the 60 piece parts study using the worst-case annealing process, Toyota calculated at 4.2 standard deviations from the mean that no part would deviate below 8.1 percent from the FMVSS standard. Considering the tolerance interval calculation method, the worst possible deviation from the standard would be –18 percent.

The NHTSA sponsored study “Driver Perception of Just Noticeable Differences of Automotive Signal Lamp Intensities” (DOT HS 808 209, September 1994) and The University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute (UMTRI) “Just Noticeable Differences for Low-Beam Headlamp Intensities.” (UMTRI–97–4, February 1997) found that a change in luminous intensity of 25 percent or less is not noticeable by most drivers. The agency noted in 1990 when it granted an inconsequentiality petition filed by Hella, Inc., “a reduction of approximately 25 percent in luminous intensity is required before the human eye can detect the difference between two lamps.” See 55 FR 37601, 37602. In the Subaru petition, the agency stated that the same considerations can be applied to reflectors as to lamps.

To verify that a deviation of –18 percent is not detectable to the human eye, Toyota and the supplier conducted evaluations of the reflected light from the noncompliant part that was produced in the 60-piece study and another reflector that was approximately 20 percent higher in reflectivity. The reflectors were mounted in a dark tunnel and set up to simulate the FMVSS No. 108 test setup at 0.2 degrees. Ten panelists were instructed to stand at a specific location 100 feet from the reflectors at a height approximating at a 0.2-degree angle to the reflectors. They were asked if the reflector brightness was the same or different. After the ten panelists completed the survey, the same panelists were asked to repeat the activity; they were unaware that the parts and setup had not been changed. This survey activity was then repeated using two parts of equal reflectivity. In these surveys, none of the panelists were able to identify the noncompliant part or correctly identify differences in reflectivity.

In addition, Toyota installed the same two parts that were checked in the dark tunnel on a MY 2018 Lexus ES350. Using the headlamps from another vehicle that was aligned 100 feet behind the ES, Toyota members visually observed the reflectivity between the two parts at night and were unable to distinguish a difference between the two reflectors. They looked the same.

2. There are no known complaints related to the noncompliance.

Toyota conducted a search of consumer complaints, field reports, dealer reports, Vehicle Owner Questionnaires (VOQs), and legal claims for the subject vehicles and found no report alleging that the rear reflectors could not be seen or were not bright

enough. This search is current as of May 29, 2019.

3. In similar situations, NHTSA has granted petitions for inconsequential noncompliance relating to the subject requirement of FMVSS No. 108.

NHTSA has previously granted at least two similar petitions for inconsequential noncompliance, one for a tail lamp and one for a side reflex reflector assembly. A brief summary of the decisions is provided below:

- Hella, 55 FR 37601, (September 12, 1990)

In the petition, Hella argued that industry experience and supporting studies have established that the human eye in the vast majority of cases cannot detect a change in luminescence unless it is more than a 25 percent increase or decrease. NHTSA stated that a reduction of approximately 25 percent in luminous intensity is required before the human eye can detect the difference between two lamps. Of the noncompliant lamps tested, the greatest disparity reported between a compliant lamp and a noncompliant lamp was 3.6 cd, which is a 20 percent higher luminous intensity than compliant lamps. According to the SAE Recommended Practice J576, this differential cannot be detected by the human eye. For this reason, the Hella petition was granted.

- Subaru, 56 FR 59971, (November 26, 1991)

Subaru submitted a petition for inconsequential noncompliance in 1991 concerning the failures of luminous intensity on the side reflex reflector. NHTSA considered the petitioner's statement that observers could not differentiate between the reflected light of complying and noncomplying reflectors at distances of 30m, 60m, and 100m. As the agency noted in 1990 when it granted an inconsequentiality petition filed by Hella, Inc., "a reduction of approximately 25 percent in luminous intensity is required before the human eye can detect the difference between two lamps." See 55 FR 37601, 37602. The agency applied the same considerations to reflectors as to lamps. The luminous transmittance failures of the Subaru reflectors were all less than 20 percent of the minimum values specified by the standard, and, therefore, they were undetectable by the naked eye. For this reason, the petition was granted.

Toyota concluded by expressing the belief that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety, and that its petition to be exempted from providing notification of the noncompliance, as required by 49

U.S.C. 30118, and a remedy for the noncompliance, as required by 49 U.S.C. 30120, should be granted.

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, any decision on this petition only applies to the subject vehicles that Toyota no longer controlled at the time it determined that the noncompliance existed. However, any decision on this petition does not relieve vehicle distributors and dealers of the prohibitions on the sale, offer for sale, or introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of the noncompliant vehicles under their control after Toyota 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).

Otto G. Matheke III,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2019-24303 Filed 11-6-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2018-0110; Notice 1]

Great Dane, LLC, Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

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

ACTION: Receipt of petition.

SUMMARY: Great Dane, LLC (Great Dane) has determined that certain model year (MY) 2019 Great Dane Freedom Platform trailers do not comply with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSS) No. 223, *Rear Impact Guards*, and FMVSS No. 224, *Rear Impact Protection*. Great Dane filed a noncompliance report dated January 2, 2019, and subsequently petitioned NHTSA on January 2, 2019, for a decision that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety. This document announces receipt of Great Dane's petition.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the petition is December 9, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on this petition. Comments must refer to the docket and notice number cited in the title of this notice and may be submitted by any of the following methods:

- **Mail:** Send comments by mail addressed to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.

- **Hand Delivery:** Deliver comments by hand to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. except for Federal Holidays.

- **Electronically:** Submit comments electronically by logging onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) website at <https://www.regulations.gov/>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

- Comments may also be faxed to (202) 493-2251.

Comments must be written in the English language, and be no greater than 15 pages in length, although there is no limit to the length of necessary attachments to the comments. If comments are submitted in hard copy form, please ensure that two copies are provided. If you wish to receive confirmation that comments you have submitted by mail were received, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard with the comments. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to <https://www.regulations.gov/>, including any personal information provided.

All comments and supporting materials received before the close of business on the closing date indicated above will be filed in the docket and will be considered. All comments and supporting materials received after the closing date will also be filed and will be considered to the fullest extent possible.

When the petition is granted or denied, notice of the decision will also be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated at the end of this notice.

All comments, background documentation, and supporting materials submitted to the docket may be viewed by anyone at the address and times given above. The documents may also be viewed on the internet at <https://www.regulations.gov/>