

longer entitled. Respondents are representative payees for children ages 15 through 17.

Type of Request: Revision of an OMB-approved information collection.

Number of Respondents: 982,357.

Frequency of Response: 1.

Average Burden per Response: 3 minutes.

Estimated Annual Burden: 49,118 hours.

3. *Request for Proof(s) from Custodian of Records—20 CFR 404.703, 404.704, 404.720, 404.721, 404.723, 404.725, & 404.728—0960–0766.* SSA sends records custodians the SSA–L707 on behalf of individuals who need help obtaining evidence of death, marriage, or divorce in connection with claims for benefits.

SSA uses the information from the SSA–L707 to determine eligibility for benefits. The respondents are custodians including statistics and religious entities, coroners, funeral directors, attending physicians, and state agencies.

Type of Request: Revision of an OMB-approved information collection.

Type of respondents	Number of respondents	Frequency of response	Average burden per response (minutes)	Total annual burden (hours)
State or Local Government	501	1	10	84
Private Sector	99	1	10	17
Totals	600			101

Faye Lipsky,

Reports Clearance Officer, Center for Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration.

[FR Doc. 2010–24058 Filed 9–24–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4191–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[U.S. DOT Docket Number NHTSA–2010–0124]

Reports, Forms, and Recordkeeping Requirements

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

ACTION: Request for public comment on proposed collection of information, amendment.

SUMMARY: Before a Federal agency can collect certain information from the public, it must receive approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Under procedures established by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before seeking OMB approval, Federal agencies must solicit public comment on proposed collections of information, including extensions and reinstatements of previously approved collections. On September 3, 2010, NHTSA published a request for comment on one collection of information for which it intends to seek OMB approval (75 FR 54217). This notice elaborates on some specific areas NHTSA is requesting comment on that were not mentioned in the original notice.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before November 2, 2010.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by the docket number in the heading of this document, by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments on the electronic docket site by clicking on “Help” or “FAQ.”
- *Hand Delivery:* 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.
- *Fax:* 202–493–2251.

Regardless of how you submit comments, you should mention the docket number of this document.

You may call the Docket Management Facility at 202–366–9826.

Instructions: For detailed instructions on submitting comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the Public Participation heading of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided.

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 in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477–78) or you may visit <http://www.dot.gov/privacy.html>.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, or the street

address listed above. Follow the online instructions for accessing the dockets.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kil-Jae Hong, NHTSA, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., W52–232, NPO–520, Washington, DC 20590. Ms. Hong’s telephone number is (202) 493–0524.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On September 3, 2010, NHTSA published a request for comment on one collection of information for which it intends to seek OMB approval (75 FR 54217). That notice explained that to further NHTSA’s development of a national tire fuel efficiency consumer information program required under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007,¹ NHTSA is proposing a multi-phased consumer research project and is currently requesting comment on the first phase of that research, which will consist of qualitative focus group market research. This notice elaborates on some specific areas NHTSA is requesting comment on that were not mentioned in the original notice. These areas are focus group location, testing for the impact of basing a tire fuel efficiency rating on rolling resistance coefficient (RRC) vs. rolling resistance force (RRF), and testing for the recognition of existing labeling.

NHTSA notes that comments have already been sought on and a public meeting has already been held on a draft research plan for the consumer research that is the subject of this collection of information.² The relevance and poignancy of stakeholders’ comments may be enhanced by reviewing that draft research plan and comments received in response to the draft research plan and public meeting.

¹ Public Law 110–140, 121 Stat. 1492 (Dec. 18, 2007).

² See Docket No. NHTSA–2010–0018.

With regard to focus group location, the notice indicated that NHTSA intended to conduct two (2) focus groups in three (3) cities. NHTSA plans to conduct the focus groups in one city each in the Northeast, South or Midwest, and the West to achieve geographic diversity. NHTSA is particularly interested in comments regarding whether or not the western location should be in California.

In 2003, the California legislature adopted Assembly Bill No. 844 (AB 844), which required the California Energy Commission to develop a comprehensive fuel efficient tire program. In 2009, a draft regulation was made public which specified testing and reporting requirements for manufacturers, described the database of fuel efficiency of replacement tires sold in California, and defined a "fuel efficient tire." As a result of these regulations, if California is included, NHTSA wonders whether the results might differ from other locations because those consumers might be more exposed to the issues of fuel efficiency and tires than other consumers, which would offer potential insight into comprehension of tire information while possibly conveying consumer understanding that is unique to consumers that have been exposed to advanced information as compared to the general population. NHTSA seeks comments on whether focus groups results from California may not be generally applicable to a national population of replacement tire consumers. On the other hand, if the results were similar to other locations, that might indicate the difficulty in raising awareness of this type of information.

With regard to *RRC* vs. *RRF*,³ in the March 30, 2010 final rule NHTSA stated that it was deferring the decision on which measurement metric was the appropriate metric to base the fuel efficiency rating upon (75 FR 15894, 15919). Previous comments received by the agency were split between those who supported basing a fuel efficiency rating on *RRF* because it directly relates to the amount of fuel consumed, and those who supported basing a fuel efficiency rating on *RRC* because ratings based on *RRF* would tend to cluster small tires around high ratings and

larger tires around low ratings. These commenters argued that basing a fuel efficiency rating on *RRC* would spread out ratings for tires available to a single consumer so that the consumer would be able to get a top-rated tire, and that denying consumers the ability to purchase a top-rated tire would discourage consumers. NHTSA believes that a rating based on *RRC* could only be used to compare tires of the same size and load rating. Therefore, from the standpoint of consumer perception, the agency's main concern is that if a consumer is looking at fuel efficiency ratings across a range of different-sized tires, e.g., if the consumer has one family vehicle that requires 18-inch replacement tires and another family vehicle that requires 15-inch replacement tires, fuel efficiency ratings based on *RRC* would not accurately reflect the contribution of a tire to fuel consumption since *RRCs* for larger tires (with greater test loads) can be lower than those of smaller tires, i.e., they would get a higher fuel efficiency rating than a small tire in a rating system based on *RRC*. To assist in a decision on this issue, NHTSA intends to explore how often consumers consider different size tires in their purchase decisions, and what the perceptual implications are if a consumer cannot find a top-rated tire among the replacement tire choices that are available for their vehicle. NHTSA requests comment on whether there is other information NHTSA could explore with regard to this issue.

Finally, NHTSA is requesting information on any labeling or other information that is currently voluntarily provided by tire manufacturers or tire retailers, on tires or otherwise. NHTSA intends to explore what information participants have seen, and how they recall, interpret, and apply it. This will assist the agency in evaluating how well the participants comprehend the information, which types of information are meaningful to their purchasing choices, and which information impacts their behavior.

Issued on: September 21, 2010.

Rebecca Pennington,

Associate Administrator, Planning, Administrative and Financial Management.

[FR Doc. 2010-24115 Filed 9-24-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Agency Information Collection Activities: Requests for Comments; Clearance of Renewed Approval of Information Collection(s): Certification Procedures for Products and Parts

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. The Federal Register Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on the following collection of information was published on June 25, 2010, vol. 75, no. 122, page 36464. 14 CFR part 21 prescribes certification standards for aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers appliances and parts. The information collected is used to determine compliance and applicant eligibility. The respondents are aircraft parts designers, manufacturers, and aircraft owners. Public burden for FAA form 8130-3 had previously been included with this information collection in error, and has been removed.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted by October 27, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carla Scott on (202) 267-9895, or by e-mail at Carla.Scott@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number: 2120-0018.

Title: Certification Procedures for Products and Parts.

Form Numbers: FAA Forms 8110-12, 8130-1, 8130-6, 8130-9, 8130-12.

Type of Review: Renewal of an information collection.

Background: 14 CFR part 21 prescribes certification standards for aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers appliances and parts. The information collected is used to determine compliance and applicant eligibility. FAA Airworthiness inspectors, designated inspectors, engineers, and designated engineers review the required data submittals to determine that aviation products and articles and their manufacturing facilities comply with the applicable requirements, and that the products and articles have no unsafe features.

Respondents: Approximately 13,339 aircraft parts designers, manufacturers, and aircraft owners.

³ *RRF* is the rolling resistance force measurement measured by a rolling resistance test procedure. *RRC* is *RRF* divided by the test load of the tire, where most test procedures specify test load as a percentage of the maximum load rating of the tire being tested. In a June 2009 notice of proposed rulemaking, NHTSA proposed to base the fuel efficiency rating on the *RRF* metric because such a rating translates more directly to the fuel required to move a tire. See 74 FR 29542 (June 22, 2009).