

conformity and associated documents (referred to as a "conformity package") the RI must submit to NHTSA under 49 CFR 592.6(d) to obtain release of the DOT Conformance bond furnished at the time the vehicle is imported.

Because it is common practice for transit bus bodies to have seating and other interior modifications made during use for the purposes of update and repair, it is expected that after many years in service at least some of the buses eligible for importation under this decision will not have the same interior configuration, controls and displays, etc., as the vehicle(s) described in the petition. Therefore, NHTSA has decided that RIs must also include in each conformity package specific proof to confirm that the vehicle was originally manufactured to conform to, or was successfully altered to conform to, each applicable standard. Any components that differ from the original equipment installed on the vehicle must be fully described, and if the presence of that component could impact the vehicle's compliance with an applicable safety standard, the conformity package must include reports of testing or inspection sufficient to establish the vehicle's compliance with that standard with the component installed. This additional information must also be supplied any time an alteration that requires replacement of a nonconforming system, such as the vehicle driver's seat or accelerator control system, differs from that originally described in the petition.

In addition to the modifications described in the petition as needed to conform the vehicle to all applicable FMVSS, NHTSA has decided that additional or alternative modifications must be performed, and, for some of those modifications, proof of conformance must be provided in the conformity package, as set forth below.

Standard No. 108—Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment: The conformity package must include documentation from the lighting manufacturer for each lamp mounted on the bus showing that the lamp has been certified as conforming to FMVSS No. 108 for the purpose for which the lamp is used. Specific proof that the headlamps meet the operating voltage requirements of FMVSS No. 108 must also be provided in the conformity package.

Standard No. 121—Air Brake Systems: Inspection of each bus to specifically verify that the critical components listed below (by the applicable paragraph in FMVSS No. 121) are present, are significantly similar to those originally installed on the Volvo B7L chassis and function as required for compliance

with FMVSS No. 121. Should any part not be present, or prevent compliance with the requirements of the standard as installed, modification of the bus and proof of conformance after modification must be included with each conformity package.

S5.1.1—Data related to reservoir volumes necessary to demonstrate conformance to compressor recharge rate.

S5.1.2.3—Check valves to protect against reservoir air loss.

S5.1.2.4—Manually operated condensate drain valve for reservoirs.

S5.1.4—In-dash pressure gauge.

S5.1.5—Device that gives a low pressure warning in accordance with this section.

S5.1.8(a)—Automatic slack adjusters.

S5.1.6.2—In-dash ABS malfunction indicator lamp/check lamp function.

S5.6.4—Identification of the method of control operation of the parking brake control.

Photographs of all brake system related controls and displays must also be included in each conformity package.

Standard No. 124—Accelerator Control Systems: Installation of a specific accelerator control system to meet the requirements of this standard was described in the petition. Documentation showing that, as modified, the vehicle conforms to the standard must be provided in each conformity package.

Standard No. 205—Glazing Materials: All glazing replaced to meet the requirements of FMVSS No. 217 must also meet all applicable requirements of FMVSS No. 205. In addition, all glazing must be inspected for compliance with FMVSS No. 205. Any noncompliant glazing must be replaced with compliant glazing and proof of compliance must be included in each conformity package.

Standard No. 217—Bus Emergency Exits and Window Retention and Release: The petition states that the vehicles must be modified by installation of an emergency escape hatch and emergency escape windows in a manner consistent with the requirements of this standard. Test reports were submitted in an effort to demonstrate that compliance with the standard can be achieved after these modifications are performed. Photographs (including images of all required labeling) and bus plan view drawings showing the location and operation of all exits, must be provided with each conformity package.

Standard No. 302—Flammability of Interior Materials: Documentation showing how the RI has confirmed that all interior components on each bus conform to all applicable requirements of this standard, including any test

reports not submitted as part of the petition, must be provided with each conformity package.

Decision

Accordingly, on the basis of the foregoing, NHTSA hereby decides that MY 2000 East Lancashire Coachbuilders Limited Double Decker Tri-Axle buses (mounted on a Volvo B7L Chassis), that were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable FMVSS, are capable of being altered to conform to all applicable Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards.

Vehicle Eligibility Number for Subject Vehicles

The importer of a vehicle admissible under any final decision must indicate on the form HS-7 accompanying entry the appropriate vehicle eligibility number indicating that the vehicle is eligible for entry. VCP-59 is the vehicle eligibility number assigned to vehicles admissible under this notice of final decision.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; Delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.95 and 501.8.

Issued on: July 30, 2015.

John Finneran,

Acting Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2015-19210 Filed 8-4-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

[Docket No. DOT-OST-2015-0153]

Agency Requests for Approval of a New Information Collection(s): Post-Challenge Year Survey—Mayors' Challenge for Safer People and Safer Streets

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary of Transportation, Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Department of Transportation (DOT) invites public comments about our intention to request the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval for a new information collection.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted by October 5, 2015.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments [identified by Docket No. DOT-OST-2015-0153] through one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

- Fax: 1 (202) 493-2251.
- Mail or Hand Delivery: Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., West Building, Room W12-140, Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except on Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rebecca Higgins, 202-366-7098, Office of Safety, Energy, and Environment, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC, 20590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number:
Title: Post-Challenge Year Survey—Mayors’ Challenge for Safer People and Safer Streets.

Form Numbers:
Type of Review: New Information Collection.

Background: Over 220 cities are voluntarily participating in the “Mayors’ Challenge” and through locally-driven efforts they are improving bike/ped safety policies, infrastructure, and awareness. This survey will collect information on the accomplishments of the Mayors’ Challenge, and will be used to identify best practices and to improve future DOT outreach to cities. Each city

has already identified a point-of-contact for the Mayors’ Challenge. This survey will be distributed electronically to these POCs through an online survey tool.

Respondents: The survey will be completed by points-of-contacts identified in the city agencies participating in the Mayors’ Challenge.

Number of Respondents: 230 cities have volunteered to participate in the Mayors’ Challenge.

Frequency: Once, upon completion of this challenge.

Number of Annual Responses: 1.

Total Annual Hour Burden: 30 minutes/respondent; Cumulative 115 hours.

Total Annual Cost Burden: \$3,388 (Based on an assumption that this would be completed by someone at an equivalent to a GS-12 level of seniority, which is \$29.46/hour.).

Synopsis of Information Collection

DOT will survey the cities who have volunteered to participate in the Mayors’ Challenge for Safer People and Safer Streets about their activities, successes, and obstacles. This information will be used to establish best practices bicycle and pedestrian

safety and will identify gaps in data and resources that DOT can provide. The questions include:

1. Which of the seven goals did you adopt, and what activities did you undertake to meet those goals? For reference, the seven goals are:

- (1) Take a Complete Streets approach;
- (2) Identify and address barriers;
- (3) Gather and track data;
- (4) Use context-sensitive designs;
- (5) Complete bike-ped networks;
- (6) Improve laws and regulations; and
- (7) Educate and enforce proper road use.

2. What were the primary challenges and obstacles to bicycle and pedestrian safety in your community, and what if any actions did you take to address these challenges and obstacles?

3. What if any changes have resulted from the challenge activities, including changes to physical infrastructure, decision-making processes, policies or procedures, enforcement, and education and awareness of your community?

4. Please use the following table to indicate whether you have data on the impact of the Mayors’ Challenge activities, and what the extent of that impact is.

| | Data available? (e.g. yes/no, and if yes, type of data) | Extent of impact (e.g. number of bicyclists, compared to previous years) |
|---|---|--|
| event attendance. survey results. crash data. walking and bicycle counts. bike lanes, sidewalks, other infrastructure. new plans, policies, laws, or campaigns. other indications of political and community support. | | |

5. Which DOT resources, tools, and data were most useful in your challenge?

6. Which non-DOT resources, tools, and data were most useful in your challenge?

7. What resources, tools, and data did you wish were available?

8. What are the most useful formats for receiving information from USDOT, and why (e.g. webinars, in-person meetings, conference calls, etc.)?

9. What efforts in your city to improve bicycle and pedestrian safety in your community were already underway at the time of the Mayors’ Challenge? How did the Mayors’ Challenge add value and/or help to fill any gaps in your city’s efforts to improve bicycle and pedestrian safety?

10. In planning and project delivery of pedestrian and/or bicycle infrastructure projects, to what extent has your city coordinated with your Metropolitan

Planning Organization (MPO), Regional Planning Organization (RPO), State Department of Transportation (DOT), and Federal Regional/Division office partners? Please note type of outreach and coordination, and outcomes it led to.

11. What were the key benefits and lessons learned as a result of the Mayors’ Challenge?

12. Do you think the Mayors’ challenge helped make any permanent changes in pedestrian and bike safety and accommodation in your city/town?

We are required to publish this notice in the **Federal Register** by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13.

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 the

Department’s performance; (b) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (c) ways for the Department 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.

Authority: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995; 44 U.S.C. chapter 35, as amended; and 49 CFR 1.48.

Issued in Washington, DC, on July 29, 2015.

Barbara McCann,

Director, Office of Safety, Energy, and Environment, Office of Policy, U.S. Department of Transportation.

[FR Doc. 2015-19189 Filed 8-4-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-9X-P