

information on the reliability and durability of its proposed device. Nissan based its belief that the device is reliable and durable since the device complied with the specific requirements for each test.

Nissan compared the device proposed for its vehicle line with other devices which NHTSA has determined to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as would compliance with the parts-marking requirements. Nissan stated that its antitheft device will be no less effective than those devices in the lines for which NHTSA has already granted full exemption from the parts-marking requirements.

Nissan stated that NHTSA's theft data have shown a decline in theft rates for vehicle lines that have been equipped with antitheft devices similar to that which Nissan proposes to install on the new line. Nissan stated that based on the agency's theft rate data, the Buick Rivera and the Oldsmobile Aurora vehicles equipped with the PASS-Key and PASS-Key II systems experienced a significant reduction in theft rates from 1987 to 1996. Nissan concluded that the data indicates that the immobilizer was effective in contributing to the theft rate reduction for these lines. Nissan stated that based on NHTSA's theft data for 1987 through 1996, the average theft rate for the Buick Riviera and the Oldsmobile Aurora vehicles without the immobilizer was 4.8970 and 5.0760, respectively and 1.4288 and 2.0955 after installation of the immobilizer device. Further review of the agency's theft data published through the 2005 MY revealed that, while there is some variation, the theft rates for both lines continued to stay below the median theft rate of 3.5826. The agency agrees that the device is substantially similar to devices in other vehicles lines for which the agency has already granted exemptions.

The agency also notes that the device will provide the five types of performance listed in § 543.6(a)(3): Promoting activation; attracting attention to the efforts of unauthorized persons to enter or operate a vehicle by means other than a key; preventing defeat or circumvention of the device by unauthorized persons; preventing operation of the vehicle by unauthorized entrants; and ensuring the reliability and durability of the device.

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 33106 and 49 CFR 543.7(b), the agency grants a petition for an exemption from the parts-marking requirements of part 541 either in whole or in part, if it determines that, based upon substantial evidence, the standard equipment

antitheft device is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of part 541. The agency finds that Nissan has provided adequate reasons for its belief that the antitheft device will reduce and deter theft. This conclusion is based on the information Nissan provided about its device.

For the foregoing reasons, the agency hereby grants in full Nissan's petition for exemption from the Rogue vehicle line from the parts-marking requirements of 49 CFR Part 541, beginning with the 2009 model year vehicles. The agency notes that 49 CFR Part 541, Appendix A-1, identifies those lines that are exempted from the Theft Prevention Standard for a given model year. 49 CFR Part 543.7(f) contains publication requirements incident to the disposition of all Part 543 petitions. Advanced listing, including the release of future product nameplates, the beginning model year for which the petition is granted and a general description of the antitheft device is necessary in order to notify law enforcement agencies of new vehicle lines exempted from the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard.

If Nissan decides not to use the exemption for this line, it must formally notify the agency, and, thereafter, the line must be fully marked as required by 49 CFR Parts 541.5 and 541.6 (marking of major component parts and replacement parts).

NHTSA notes that if Nissan wishes in the future to modify the device on which this exemption is based, the company may have to submit a petition to modify the exemption. Part 543.7(d) states that a Part 543 exemption applies only to vehicles that belong to a line exempted under this part and equipped with the anti-theft device on which the line's exemption is based. Further, § 543.9(c)(2) provides for the submission of petitions "to modify an exemption to permit the use of an antitheft device similar to but differing from the one specified in that exemption."

The agency wishes to minimize the administrative burden that Part 543.9(c)(2) could place on exempted vehicle manufacturers and itself. The agency did not intend Part 543 to require the submission of a modification petition for every change to the components or design of an antitheft device. The significance of many such changes could be *de minimis*. Therefore, NHTSA suggests that if the manufacturer contemplates making any changes the effects of which might be characterized as *de minimis*, it should

consult the agency before preparing and submitting a petition to modify.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 33106; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.

Issued on: March 24, 2008.

Stephen R. Kratzke,

Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. E8-6493 Filed 3-27-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

[OMB Control No. 2900—New (10-21086)]

Agency Information Collection Activities (National Survey of Women Veterans) Under OMB Review

AGENCY: Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501-3521), this notice announces that the Veterans Health Administration (VHA), Department of Veterans Affairs, has submitted the collection of information abstracted below to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The PRA submission describes the nature of the information collection and its expected cost and burden and includes the actual data collection instrument.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before April 28, 2008.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments on the collection of information through <http://www.Regulations.gov>; or to VA's OMB Desk Officer, OMB Human Resources and Housing Branch, New Executive Office Building, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503 (202) 395-7316. Please refer to "OMB Control No. 2900—New (10-21086)" in any correspondence.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Denise McLamb, Records Management Service (005R1B), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20420, (202) 461-7485, fax (202) 273-0443 or e-mail denise.mclamb@mail.va.gov. Please refer to "OMB Control No. 2900—New (10-21086)."

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: National Survey of Women Veterans, VA Form 10-21086(NR).

OMB Control Number: 2900—New (2900—New (10-21086)).

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Abstract: The data collected from the survey will be used to identify the healthcare needs of women veterans, and the barriers they experience with VA healthcare use. The information will be used to improve access and the quality of healthcare for women veterans, and to evaluate the healthcare differ among women veterans of different periods of military service.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on this collection of information was published on January 7, 2008 at pages 1265–1266.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Estimated Annual Burden: 2,625 hours.

Estimated Average Burden per Respondent: 45 minutes.

Frequency of Response: One time.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 3,500.

Dated: March 20, 2008.

By direction of the Secretary.

Denise McLamb,

Program Analyst, Records Management Service.

[FR Doc. E8–6358 Filed 3–27–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

[OMB Control No. 2900–0085]

Proposed Information Collection (Appeal to Board of Veterans' Appeals) Activity Comment Request

AGENCY: Board of Veterans' Appeals, Department of Veterans Affairs.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Board of Veterans' Appeals (BVA), Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), is announcing an opportunity for public comment on the proposed collection of certain information by the agency. Under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, Federal agencies are required to publish notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information, including each proposed revision of a currently approved collection, and allow 60 days for public comment in response to the notice. This notice solicits comments on the information required in processing appeals for denial of VA benefits.

DATES: Written comments and recommendations on the proposed

collection of information should be received on or before May 27, 2008.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments on the collection of information through <http://www.Regulations.gov> or to Sue Hamlin, Board of Veterans' Appeals (01C), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20420 or e-mail sue.hamlin@va.gov. Please refer to "OMB Control No. 2900–0085" in any correspondence. During the comment period, comments may be viewed online through the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) at <http://www.Regulations.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sue Hamlin at (202) 565–5686.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the PRA of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13; 44 U.S.C. 3501–3521), Federal agencies must obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for each collection of information they conduct or sponsor. This request for comment is being made pursuant to Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA.

With respect to the following collection of information, BVA invites comments on: (1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of BVA's functions, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) the accuracy of BVA's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or the use of other forms of information technology.

Titles:

a. Appeal to Board of Veterans' Appeals, VA Form 9.

b. Withdrawal of Services by a Representative.

c. Request for Changes in Hearing Date.

d. Motions for Reconsideration.

OMB Control Number: 2900–0085.

Type of Review: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Abstract:

a. Appeal to Board of Veterans' Appeals, VA Form 9, may be used by appellants to complete their appeal to the Board of Veterans' Appeals (BVA) from a denial of VA benefits. The information is used by BVA to identify the issues in dispute and prepare a decision responsive to the appellant's contentions and the legal and factual issues raised.

b. Withdrawal of Services by a Representative: When the appellant's

representative withdraws from a case, both the appellant and the BVA must be informed so that the appellant's rights may be adequately protected and so that the BVA may meet its statutory obligations to provide notice to the current representative.

c. Request for Changes in Hearing Date: VA provides hearings to appellants and their representatives, as required by basic Constitutional due-process and by Title 38 U.S.C. 7107(b). From time to time, hearing dates and/or times are changed, hearing requests withdrawn and new hearings requested after failure to appear at a scheduled hearing. The information is used to comply with the appellants' or their representatives' requests.

d. Motions for Reconsideration: Decisions by BVA are final unless the Chairman orders reconsideration of the decision either on the Chairman's initiative, or upon motion of a claimant. The Board Chairman, or his designee, uses the information provided in deciding whether reconsideration of a Board decision should be granted.

Affected Public: Individuals or households, business or other for profit, and not for profit institutions.

Estimated Total Annual Burden

a. Appeal to Board of Veterans' Appeals, VA Form 9—45,850 hours.

b. Withdrawal of Services by a Representative—183 hours.

c. Request for Changes in Hearing Date—1,212 hours.

d. Motions for Reconsideration—846 hours.

Estimated Average Burden Per Respondent

a. Appeal to Board of Veterans' Appeals, VA Form 9—1 hour.

b. Withdrawal of Services by a Representative—20 minutes.

c. Request for Changes in Hearing Date—15 minutes (hearing date change), 15 minutes (request to withdraw a hearing),—1 hour (requests to change a motion).

d. Motions for Reconsideration—1 hour.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Estimated Total Number of Respondents

a. Appeal to Board of Veterans' Appeals, VA Form 9—45,850.

b. Withdrawal of Services by a Representative—550.

c. Request for Changes in Hearing Date—2,733.

d. Motions for Reconsideration—846.

Dated: March 20, 2008.