

the normal process and submit work plans to the appropriate FHWA division office. For more information on the SEP-14 process, please see: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/programadmin/contracts/sep_a.cfm.

In particular, with respect to projects involving activities that otherwise meet the requirements for the use of FHWA and HUD funds, States may experiment under SEP-14 with combining these funding sources for single, integrated projects that are procured and bid under a single contract while complying with training, employment, and contracting requirements of HUD's Section 3, to the greatest extent feasible. The purpose of the experiment is to gauge the extent to which HUD funding may be used for highway projects, the effects on competition whenever HUD's economic opportunity requirements are used on a joint FHWA/HUD project, and the extent to which the alignment of FHWA and HUD requirements further livability.

The FHWA will only consider the possible use of HUD's economic opportunity requirements under SEP-14 in the context of a joint FHWA/HUD project and only to the extent necessary to comply with applicable HUD statutes. The FHWA will not consider the use of such preferences unless necessary to meet the requirements of a Federal grant-in-aid program.

In developing their work plans, States should address, at a minimum, the following points:

1. Competition

a. States should describe how they will evaluate the effects of HUD's economic opportunity requirements on competitive bidding. In doing so, the States may wish to compare the bids received for the proposed project to prior projects of similar size and scope and in the same geographic area.

b. States should quantify and report on the expected economic benefits from advancing the joint FHWA/HUD project under a single contract.

c. States wishing to utilize SEP-14 to permit the use of HUD-required hiring preferences on joint FHWA/HUD projects should identify the amount of HUD and FHWA funding involved in the project as well as the estimated total project cost. In order to qualify for a SEP-14 approval to use a geographic preference for a joint FHWA/HUD project, the amount of HUD funding involved with the project must be at least 10 percent of the amount of Title 23 eligible work, or with respect to projects financed with \$100,000,000 or more in Federal funding in the aggregate, 5 percent of such eligible

work. In any event, the FHWA may reject SEP-14 work plans for projects with only de minimis amount of HUD funding.

d. States should address whether the HUD provision at issue conflicts with FHWA regulations and is necessary to meet HUD program requirements.

e. The work plan should address the degree to which the project enhances livability and sustainability.

2. Livability

Livability investments are projects that not only deliver transportation benefits, but are also designed and planned in such a way that they have a positive impact on qualitative measures of community life. This element of long-term outcomes delivers benefits that are inherently difficult to measure. However, it is implicit to livability that its benefits are shared and therefore magnified by the number of potential users in the affected community.

The workplan should provide a description of the affected community and the scale of the project's impact. Factors relevant to whether a project improves the quality of the living and working environment of a community include:

a. Will the project significantly enhance user mobility through the creation of more convenient transportation options for travelers?

b. Will the project improve existing transportation choices by enhancing points of modal connectivity or by reducing congestion on existing modal assets?

c. Will the project improve accessibility and transport services for economically disadvantaged populations, non-drivers, senior citizens, and persons with disabilities, or to make goods, commodities, and services more readily available to these groups?

d. Is the project the result of a planning process which coordinated transportation and land-use planning decisions and encouraged community participation in the process?

3. Sustainability

Sustainability refers to whether a project promotes a more environmentally sustainable transportation system. The workplan should address the following issues relevant to sustainability:

a. Does the project improve energy efficiency, reduce dependence on oil and/or reduce greenhouse gas emissions? Applicants are encouraged to provide quantitative information regarding expected reductions in

emissions of CO₂ or fuel consumption as a result of the project, or expected use of clean or alternative sources of energy. Projects that demonstrate a projected decrease in the movement of people or goods by less energy-efficient vehicles or systems will be given priority under this factor.

b. Does the project maintain, protect or enhance the environment, as evidenced by its avoidance of adverse environmental impacts (for example, adverse impacts related to air quality, wetlands, and endangered species) and/or by its environmental benefits (for example, improved air quality, wetlands creation or improved habitat connectivity)?

c. Does the project further the goals of the DOT, HUD, and EPA Sustainable Communities Partnership discussed above?

Authority: 23 U.S.C. 315.

Issued on: June 21, 2010.

Victor M. Mendez,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2010-15438 Filed 6-24-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Seventh Meeting—RTCA Special Committee 220: Automatic Flight Guidance and Control

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of RTCA Special Committee 220: Automatic Flight Guidance and Control meeting.

SUMMARY: The FAA is issuing this notice to advise the public of a meeting of RTCA Special Committee 220: Automatic Flight Guidance and Control.

DATES: The meeting will be held July 13-15, 2010. July 13th and 14th from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. and July 15th from 9 a.m. to 2 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Bourbon Orleans Hotel, 717 Orleans Street, New Orleans, LA 70116, *Phone:* 504-571-4687, *Fax:* 504-525-8166, *E-Mail:* <http://www.bourbonorleans.com>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: (1) RTCA Secretariat, 1828 L Street, NW., Suite 805, Washington, DC, 20036; telephone (202) 833-9339; fax (202) 833-9434; Web site <http://www.rtca.org>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, 5 U.S.C., Appendix 2), notice is hereby given for a Special Committee 220: Automatic Flight Guidance and

Control meeting. The agenda will include:

- Welcome/Agenda Overview.
- Consider for Approval—New

Document—*Minimum Operational Performance Standards (MOPS) for Automatic Flight Guidance and Control Systems and Equipment*, RTCA Paper No. 088–10/SC220–042.

- Continue Development of Installation Guidance White Papers.
- Wrap-up and Review of Action Items.
- Establish Dates, Location, Agenda for Next Meeting, Other Business.

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability. With the approval of the chairmen, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present statements or obtain information should contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. Members of the public may present a written statement to the committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, DC, on June 17, 2010.

Meredith Gibbs,

RTCA Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 2010–15430 Filed 6–24–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2010–0080; Notice 1]

Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company, Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company, (Goodyear),¹ has determined that approximately 14,826 passenger car tires manufactured between August of 2007 and May of 2009, 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*.

Goodyear has filed an appropriate report 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), Goodyear has petitioned 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.

¹ Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company (Goodyear), a replacement equipment manufacturer, is incorporated in the state of Ohio.

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

Affected are approximately 14,826 sizes P195/55R15 84V and P225/60R16 97H Goodyear brand Arizonian Silver Edition Plus model passenger car tires manufactured between August of 2007 and May of 2009 at Goodyear's plant located in Otrokovice, Czech Republic.

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, these provisions only apply to the 14,826² tires that have already passed from the manufacturer to an owner, purchaser, or dealer.

Paragraph S5.5(f) of FMVSS No. 139 require 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. 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 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 * * *

Goodyear explains that the noncompliance is that, due to a mold labeling error, the sidewall marking on the reference side of the tires incorrectly

² Goodyear's petition, which was filed under 49 CFR part 556, requests an agency decision to exempt Goodyear as a replacement equipment manufacturer from the notification and recall responsibilities of 49 CFR part 573 for 14,826 of the affected tires. However, the agency cannot relieve Goodyear distributors 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 Goodyear recognized that the subject noncompliance existed. Those tires must be brought into conformance, exported, or destroyed.

describes the actual number of plies in the tread area of the tires as required by paragraph S5.5(f). Specifically, the tires in question were inadvertently manufactured with "Tread Plies: 2 Polyester + 2 steel." The labeling should have been "Tread Plies: 2 Polyester + 1 polyamide + 2 steel."

Goodyear also explains that while the noncompliant tires are mislabeled "the tires meet or exceed all applicable Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards."

Goodyear reported that this noncompliance was brought to their attention during an audit of sidewall labeling.

Goodyear argues that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety because the noncompliant sidewall marking does not create an unsafe condition and all other labeling requirements have been met.

Goodyear points out that NHTSA has previously granted similar petitions for non-compliances in sidewall marking.

Goodyear additionally states that it has corrected the affected tire molds and all future production will have the correct material shown on the sidewall.

In summation, Goodyear believes that the described noncompliance of its tires to meet the requirements of FMVSS No. 139 is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that its petition, to exempt 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, and 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.

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

a. By mail addressed to: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590.

b. By hand delivery to U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200