

to the circumference of the equivalent circle in centimeters ( $\pm 0.64$  centimeters).”

2. Arai believes NHTSA’s reasons for requiring the helmet’s discrete size is primarily to determine the appropriate headform for conducting the performance testing of paragraph S6.1 of FMVSS No. 218. In promulgating the discrete size label, Arai cited the agency as saying that it added the discrete size requirement to the standard to “eliminate enforcement problems.” See 73 FR 57297, 57304 (October 2, 2008). Arai says that the agency had previously permitted generic head sizes on helmet labels, however, they lacked the precision the agency desired for enforcing the helmet standard, raising potential problems with the objective requirements of 49 U.S.C. 30111(a). Arai says that NHTSA explained its reasoning in the rulemaking for specifying the discrete size and cited the following:

a. The reason for this is to eliminate enforcement problems that arise when helmets are labeled only with a generic size specification (e.g. Small, Medium, or Large). Enforceability problems can arise because while S6.1 specifies which headform is used to test helmets with a particular “designated discrete size or size range,” a helmet’s generic size may not correspond to the same size ranges that the agency uses to determine which headform to use for testing.

3. Arai stated that in the final rule, NHTSA further elaborated that defining the discrete size “would have two benefits:”

a. First, it would provide certainty as to the headform on which the helmet would be tested by NHTSA, thereby, improving the enforceability of the standard. Second, it would provide more precise information to customers. Further that the requirement would in no way preclude manufacturers from specifying a generic size in addition to the discrete size on the size label.

4. Arai believes that the primary reason for requiring the discrete size is related to enforceability of the performance tests and that a label that is present on the helmet at the time of NHTSA’s testing, but that may not be permanently attached to the helmet does not expose the user of the noncompliant helmet to a “significantly greater risk” than to a user of a compliant helmet.

5. Arai states that NHTSA tested Arai Helmet under FMVSS No. 218, and that the testing demonstrated that these helmets meet the performance standards. The discrete label helmet, tested by NHTSA, permitted the Agency to select the correct headform for the

Arai Corsair-X, size small, helmet that was tested. According to Arai, the primary purpose of the discrete size label, specifically its enforceability of NHTSA’s objective test standards, was met by the noncompliant helmet.

6. Arai believes that in the FMVSS No. 218 final rule, NHTSA explained that while the discrete label would provide “more precise information to customers,” NHTSA acknowledged that generic sizes could also be used on helmets. Arai believes this indicates that the value to customers of a “more precise” helmet size serves limited safety benefits. Arai says that NHTSA did not claim the discrete size served a safety purpose, but stated that “discrete size labeling requirements will both improve customer information regarding the size of the helmet and avert potential enforceability problems.” See 76 FR 28145.

7. Arai stated that the noncompliance arose from the permanency of the label, not the content and that the label would be present, at a minimum, to the first purchaser. Further, Arai states that another label showing the discrete size of the helmet is sewn into a tag in the headliner; moreover, the helmet’s packaging provides the size information and secondhand purchasers could try on the helmet to determine whether it properly fits; accordingly, the consumer would have sizing information available to determine the correct helmet size for purchase.

8. Arai says that in a petition related to a noncompliance that resulted from a goggle strap potentially obscuring the DOT label of a motorcycle helmet, NHTSA agreed that the noncompliance was inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. See 79 FR 47720. Arai went on to write that NHTSA reasoned that “the presence of the strap holder which obscures the DOT label does not affect the helmet’s ability to protect the wearer in the event of a crash if that helmet meets or exceeds the performance requirements of FMVSS No. 218.” Arai believes the same reasoning applies here as well.

9. Arai stated their belief that the helmets potential failure to permanently provide “customer information” does not pose a “significantly greater risk” to the user of a noncompliant helmet compared to the user of a compliant helmet. Arai says they are not aware of any warranty claims, field reports, customer complaints, legal claims, or any incidents or injuries related to the subject noncompliance.

Arai expressed 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 equipment that Arai no longer controlled at the time it determined that the noncompliance existed. However, any decision on this petition does not relieve equipment distributors and dealers of the prohibitions on the sale, offer for sale, or introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of the noncompliant equipment under their control after Arai 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. 2019-19722 Filed 9-11-19; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Bureau of the Fiscal Service

#### Proposed Collection of Information: Management of Federal Agency Disbursements

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of the Treasury, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. Currently the Bureau of the Fiscal Service within the Department of the Treasury is soliciting comments concerning the Management of Federal Agency Disbursements.

**DATES:** Written comments should be received on or before November 12, 2019 to be assured of consideration.

**ADDRESSES:** Direct all written comments and requests for additional information

to Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Bruce A. Sharp, Room #4006–A, P.O. Box 1328, Parkersburg, WV 26106–1328, or [bruce.sharp@fiscal.treasury.gov](mailto:bruce.sharp@fiscal.treasury.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title:* Management of Federal Agency Disbursements.

*OMB Number:* 1530–0016.

*Form Number:* None.

*Abstract:* This regulation requires that most Federal payments be made by Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT); sets forth waiver requirements; and provides for a low-cost Treasury-designated account to individuals at a financial institution that offers such accounts.

*Current Actions:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

*Type of Review:* Regular.

*Affected Public:* Individuals or Households, Business or other for-profit institutions, Not-for-profit Institutions.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 1,300.

*Estimated Time per Respondent:* 15 minutes.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 325.

*Request for Comments:* Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. Comments are invited on: 1. Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; 2. the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information; 3. ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; 4. ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and 5. estimates of capital or start-up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of services to provide information.

Dated: September 4, 2019.

**Bruce A. Sharp,**

*Bureau Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2019–19758 Filed 9–11–19; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4810–AS–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY**

**Bureau of the Fiscal Service**

**Proposed Collection of Information: Direct Deposit, Go Direct, and Direct Express Sign-Up Forms**

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of the Treasury, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. Currently the Bureau of the Fiscal Service within the Department of the Treasury is soliciting comments concerning the Direct Deposit, Go Direct, and Direct Express Sign-Up Forms.

**DATES:** Written comments should be received on or before November 12, 2019 to be assured of consideration.

**ADDRESSES:** Direct all written comments and requests for additional information to Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Bruce A. Sharp, Room #4006–A, P.O. Box 1328, Parkersburg, WV 26106–1328, or [bruce.sharp@fiscal.treasury.gov](mailto:bruce.sharp@fiscal.treasury.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title:* Direct Deposit, Go Direct, and Direct Express Sign-Up Forms.

*OMB Number:* 1530–0006.

*Form Number:* SF–1199A, FS Form 1200 (English/Spanish), FS Form 1200VADE, FS Form 1201L, FS Form 1201S.

*Abstract:* This series of forms is used by recipients to authorize the deposit of Federal payments into their accounts at financial institutions. The information on the forms routes the direct deposit payment to the correct account at the financial institution.

*Current Actions:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

*Type of Review:* Regular.

*Affected Public:* Individuals or Households, Business or other Not-for Profit, Federal Government.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 406,175.

*Estimated Time per Respondent:* 10 minutes.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 67,786.

*Request for Comments:* Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. Comments are invited on: 1. Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; 2. the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information; 3. ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; 4. ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on

respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and 5. estimates of capital or start-up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of services to provide information.

Dated: September 4, 2019.

**Bruce A. Sharp,**

*Bureau Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2019–19757 Filed 9–11–19; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4810–AS–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY**

**Bureau of the Fiscal Service**

**Proposed Collection of Information: Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT) Market Research Study**

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of the Treasury, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. Currently the Bureau of the Fiscal Service within the Department of the Treasury is soliciting comments concerning the Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT) Market Research Study.

**DATES:** Written comments should be received on or before November 12, 2019 to be assured of consideration.

**ADDRESSES:** Direct all written comments and requests for additional information to Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Bruce A. Sharp, Room #4006–A, P.O. Box 1328, Parkersburg, WV 26106–1328, or [bruce.sharp@fiscal.treasury.gov](mailto:bruce.sharp@fiscal.treasury.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title:* Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT) Market Research Study.

*OMB Number:* 1530–0022.

*Form Number:* None.

*Abstract:* This is a generic clearance to conduct customer satisfaction surveys, focus groups, and interviews among recipients of federal benefit and vendor payments through EFT. The need for this market research continues to arise from a Congressional directive that accompanied legislation enacted in 1996, as part of the Debt Collection Improvement Act (Pub. L. 104–134), expanding the scope of check recipients required to use direct deposit to receive Federal benefit payments (see 31 U.S.C. 3332). Congress directed Treasury to “study the socioeconomic and