

**SUMMARY:** FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an Environmental Impact Statement will be prepared for proposed transportation improvements in the Tooele Valley area of Tooele County, Utah.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Anthony Sarhan, Area Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, 2520 West 4700 South, Suite 9A, Salt Lake City, UT 84118, Telephone: (801) 963-0182; or Daniel Young, Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) Region 2 Project Manager, 2010 South 2760 West, Salt Lake City, UT 84104. Telephone: (801) 975-4819.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The FHWA, in cooperation with UDOT and Tooele County, will prepare an EIS on a proposal to address current and projected north-south traffic demand in the Tooele Valley area of Tooele County. The proposed project study area is bounded by Sheep Lane to the west, SR-36 to the east, the Tooele Army Depot (TEAD), SR-112, and Tooele City to the south, and I-80 to the north.

FHWA, UDOT, and Tooele County implemented an Environmental Assessment (EA), in May of 2007, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). During the EA, it was determined by the Joint-Lead Agencies to up-scope the study to an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The EIS will conform to the environmental review process established in Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: a Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). The Section 6002 environmental review process requires the following activities: the identification and invitation of cooperating and participating agencies; the establishment of a coordination plan; and opportunities for additional agency and public comment on the project's purpose and need, alternatives and methodologies for determining impacts. Additionally, a public hearing following the release of the draft EIS will also be provided. Public notice advertisements and direct mailings will notify interested parties of the time and place of public meetings and the public hearing.

The EIS will take into account all aspects of the study previously completed during the Environmental Assessment process. Scoping letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments were sent to appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, and to organizations and citizens who have previously expressed, or who are known to have, an interest

in this proposal. A public scoping meeting to which agencies and the public were invited was held on June 13, 2007 in Tooele County. The public, as well as Federal, State, and local agencies, were invited to participate in a project scoping process. From this participation a number of alternatives were developed and environmental issues and resources identified.

FHWA will continue to study and consider a reasonable range of alternatives which meet the project purpose and needs. These alternatives include (1) Taking no action; (2) Using alternative travel modes; (3) Upgrading and adding lanes to the existing roadway network including SR-36; and (4) Constructing a highway/expressway on a new location through the project study area.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues are identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested agencies and parties. Cooperating and participating agency invitation letters will be sent out following the publication of the Notice of Intent. Comments and suggestions concerning this proposed action and the EIS should be directed to FHWA at the address provided above.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20-.205, Highway Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)

Issued on: February 26, 2008.

**Edward T. Woolford,**

*Environmental Program Manager, FHWA—Utah Division.*

[FR Doc. E8-3981 Filed 2-29-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-22-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

**[NHTSA Docket No. NHTSA-2007-0038]**

### Notice and Request for Information and Comment on Development and Application of Crash Warning Interface Metrics

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice and request for information and comment on development and application of crash warning interface metrics.

**SUMMARY:** During the NHTSA-led Human Factors Forum on Advanced

Vehicle Safety Technologies in early 2007, participants from the automobile industry, government, and academia gathered to discuss the research necessary to ensure that future design and operation of these technologies are developed with an understanding of the driver's ability to use them. Underlying this objective is a requirement to have techniques and metrics to quantify how well drivers can use and benefit from the technologies. Without common, reliable, and safety-related metrics, it is difficult to develop, evaluate, and compare different systems as well as to determine the impact of non-standardized warning interfaces.

To address this issue, NHTSA is initiating a program to develop a set of standard metrics and test procedures to assess the Driver-Vehicle Interface (DVI) of Advanced Crash Warning Systems (ACWS). ACWS are technologies to assist drivers who may be unaware of impending collisions by alerting them of potential threats. Examples include forward collision warnings, lane departure warnings, and road departure warnings. The DVI is the means by which ACWS communicate with drivers to help them avoid a threat. In order for ACWS to achieve their intended safety benefits, drivers need to be able to quickly understand the ACWS threat information and respond appropriately without confusion. The warning timing, reliability, warning modes, device controls, and displays are examples of the DVI characteristics that can affect the ability of drivers to achieve the intended safety benefits without possible adverse consequences. Crash Warning Interface Metrics (CWIM) are derived from tests of drivers' performance using ACWS, indicating the compatibility of the DVI with drivers' capabilities and needs.

This notice invites comments, suggestions, and recommendations from all individuals and organizations that have an interest in the development and use of Crash Warning Interface Metrics. NHTSA requests comments to assist the agency in identifying, evaluating, and selecting CWIM and associated test methods for assessing the role of the DVI in influencing driver performance with ACWS.

**DATES:** You should submit your comments early enough to ensure that Docket Management receives them not later than April 17, 2008. Late comments may be considered.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by DOT Docket ID Number NHTSA-2007-0038 by any of the following methods:

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

• *Fax*: 202-493-2251.

• *Mail*: Docket Management Facility, M-30, U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building, Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590.

• *Hand Delivery or Courier*: West Building, Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

*Instructions*: For detailed instructions on submitting comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the Public Participation heading in 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. Please see the Privacy Act heading below.

*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).

*Docket*: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to <http://www.regulations.gov> at any time or to West Building, Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**: Eric Traube, Office of Human Vehicle Performance Research, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone number: 202-366-5673; E-mail [Eric.Traube@dot.gov](mailto:Eric.Traube@dot.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**: One recent development in vehicle safety technology has been the introduction of Advanced Crash Warning Systems (ACWS). These systems alert drivers about emerging hazardous situations using auditory, visual, or haptic warnings. In some cases, limited vehicle control action, such as braking or steering, are initiated to alert drivers to respond. Systems that do not warn or provide some type of feedback to the driver would not be considered ACWS.

Examples of ACWS include (but are not limited to) road departure warnings, lane change (blind spot) warnings, adaptive cruise control, curve speed warnings, and forward collision warnings.

While the implementation of ACWS in production vehicles appears to be increasing, the question remains as to whether ACWS will produce significant safety improvements or will introduce unforeseen problems, particularly if drivers are unfamiliar with ACWS warnings. The NHTSA-sponsored Human Factors Forum on Advanced Vehicle Safety Technologies was held in 2007 to begin to address this issue.

A key to ACWS effectiveness is the quality of its interface, which can affect the driver's performance as well as acceptance of the technology. The interface of an ACWS consists of the controls that drivers use to adjust the system operation and any visual, auditory, or haptic warnings as well as operational cues that can influence driver actions. Whether drivers will be able to effectively utilize this feedback to avoid crashes may be determined through tests that measure various aspects of driver/vehicle response, such as brake reaction time, gas pedal release time, brake force, threat recognition, response appropriateness, eye glance behaviors, etc. Because different manufacturers employ different test protocols, measures, and criteria to determine the design of the Driver-Vehicle Interface (DVI), a variety of interfaces have been proposed and in some cases deployed in production vehicles.

The Forum's focus on driver centered design highlighted the importance of these issues. Attendees stressed that future research should determine how to assess if drivers understand the system, if the system leads to appropriate driver reactions, and if drivers accept the new systems. Other discussion focused on the unintended consequences—understanding how inadequate mental models may affect safety and how design can strengthen those models. In addition, discussion addressed research needs related to integration of interfaces when several warning systems are installed. Other topics included the question of designing interfaces compatible with the capabilities of the majority of the driving population and compatible with each other. The later is where the topic of interface standardization was addressed as an approach to minimize driver confusion.

Without a meaningful basis for evaluating the driver/vehicle interface, the research topics suggested at the

Forum would be difficult to resolve. In order to better evaluate and compare different ACWS interfaces, NHTSA has initiated a major research effort to develop human factors test protocols and related metrics of driver/system performance that will form the basis for a set of crash warning interface metrics (CWIM). The development of CWIM will benefit public safety by helping to identify effective ACWS. Secondly, CWIM will help to assess the whether lack of standardization of ACWS interface characteristics could confuse drivers and compromise system effectiveness. The issues of standardization and CWIM are interrelated because without metrics, the effects of non-standardized DVIs on driver performance cannot be objectively assessed. In addition, NHTSA may use results from the CWIM project to enhance test procedures developed under the Advanced Crash Avoidance Technology program and other ongoing activities.

NHTSA requests comments to assist the agency in identifying, evaluating, and selecting CWIM and associated test methods for assessing the role of the DVI in influencing driver performance with ACWS. The agency is interested in comments related to both the scientific merit of different metrics as well as the practical or institutional considerations for end users of CWIM.

While the research effort is making use of published research, guidelines, standards, and other materials, it will benefit greatly from the experience and opinion of various stakeholder groups, who face related issues. Therefore, we hope to receive comments that will reflect lessons learned, new ideas and approaches, criteria for optimal methods, practical concerns in application, and other information unlikely to be reflected in published literature. Responses to this notice may also help to provide greater consistency with current practice and assure maximum usefulness.

The following are some of the key issues that the agency would like commenters to address. In addition to general comments, the agency requests submission of documents, studies, test protocols, or references relevant to the issues.

#### A. Potential Measures and Procedures

(A1) What techniques, metrics, and criteria are now being used by vehicle manufacturers for developing and evaluating the human factor aspects of interface design and operation of ACWS at various stages of product development? What tools and environments (e.g. simulators, test

tracks, etc.) are used to evaluate DVIs? Are there "lessons learned" regarding their use, practicality, or acceptance? What measures and procedures are the most predictive of relevant safety parameters?

(A2) To what extent are DVI assessment techniques shared industry-wide and to what extent are these methods proprietary? What performance requirements, standards or guidance documents have been used by vehicle manufacturers and/or system suppliers to address the human factors aspects of the design and evaluation of CWIM for ACWS? Are they helpful? What are their limitations?

(A3) If various functions (e.g., Adaptive Cruise Control (ACC), Frontal Crash Warning (FCW), Lane Departure Warning (LDW)) are packaged together as an integrated in-vehicle system, can CWIM be applied individually to each function or is there a need to treat each function in the context of the other functions present as well as other aspects of vehicle design? How can or should this be done? Are there common metrics and protocols that can be used to assess several ACWS?

## B. Evaluation of CWIM

(B1) What criteria should be used to determine the most sensitive, reliable, relevant, and useful metrics?

(B2) If consumers are annoyed or otherwise dislike the system, they may turn it off or not purchase it. How should consumer acceptance or driver annoyance be evaluated with respect to their influence on system effectiveness?

(B3) Driver response to ACWS can vary from person to person. Even the same person can vary in performance depending on their state of mind, e.g., drowsy or distracted. What subsets of the population need to be included in developing criteria for CWIM? How should their needs and capabilities be integrated into the assessment?

(B4) What type of evaluation of the DVI is being done or should be done to follow up on driver performance with production systems and its implication for the validity of CWIM?

## C. Applying CWIM

(C1) CWIM may be used by suppliers, vehicle manufacturers, and the Government to design, evaluate, and compare usability and potential safety implications of ACWS. However, protocols that are too complicated or costly may be difficult to implement. Protocols that are perceived as invalid or not sensitive to different characteristics of interface design may not be used. What are the practical considerations that need to be factored

into the development of metrics and related test protocols to make them useful and also acceptable to those who must apply the methods? What factors should be considered in the choice of test equipment (e.g., simulators, test tracks, vehicle instrumentation) needed to collect driver data?

(C2) As the number of ACWS increases in the vehicle fleet, the lack of standardization of the DVI among different vehicle makes and models may increase the likelihood of driver confusion in responding to the warning information intended to assist the driver. This lack of standardized design and operation of ACWS may reduce the safety benefits of these technologies. What mechanism (e.g., voluntary standards promulgated by SAE, ISO, or NHTSA or mandatory standards set forth in the FMVSS, etc.) should be used to standardize CWIM? How can standardization be balanced against restricting innovation? What test procedures and metrics can be applied to objectively evaluate the need for standardization? What criteria should be used to judge the need for standardization?

(C3) How should the criteria for acceptability be determined; that is, what determines if a DVI is "good enough"? Also, how should the metrics be calibrated to determine if differences between measured values are of practical significance?

## D. Research Needs

(D1) What research or other steps are required to identify CWIM and establish their validity as a basis for assessment?

(D2) What is the best way to encourage and coordinate international harmonized research on CWIM?

## Public Participation

### A. How do I prepare and submit comments?

Your comments must be written and in English. To ensure that your comments are correctly filed in the Docket, please include the docket number of this document in your comments.

Your primary comments must not be more than 15 pages long. (49 CFR 553.21). However, you may attach additional documents to your primary comments. There is no limit on the length of the attachments.

Please submit two copies of your comments, including the attachments, to Docket Management at the address given above under **ADDRESSES**.

Comments may also be submitted to the docket electronically on the *Federal eRulemaking Portal* at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

*www.regulations.gov*. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

### B. How can I be sure my comments were received?

If you wish Docket Management to notify you upon its receipt of your comments, enclose a self-addressed, stamped postcard in the envelope containing your comments. Upon receiving your comments, Docket Management will return the postcard by mail.

### C. How do I submit confidential business information?

If you wish to submit any information under a claim of confidentiality, send three copies of your complete submission, including the information you claim to be confidential business information, to the Chief Counsel, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590. Include a cover letter supplying the information specified in our confidential business information regulation (49 CFR part 512).

In addition, send two copies from which you have deleted the claimed confidential business information to Docket Management at the address given above under **ADDRESSES**, or submit them electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

### D. Will the agency consider late comments?

We will consider all comments that Docket Management receives before the close of business on the comment closing date indicated above under **DATES**. To the extent possible, we will also consider comments that Docket Management receives after that date.

### E. How can I read the comments submitted by other people?

You may read the comments received by the Docket Management at the address given under **ADDRESSES**. The hours of the Docket are indicated above in the same location. To read the comments on the Internet, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for accessing the docket.

Please note that even after the comment closing date, we will continue to file relevant information on the docket as it becomes available. Further, some people may submit late comments. Accordingly, we recommend that you periodically check the docket for new material.

Issued on February 26, 2008.

**Joseph N. Kanianthra,**

*Associate Administrator for Vehicle Safety Research.*

[FR Doc. E8-4004 Filed 2-29-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-69-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2007-28734; Notice 2]

#### DaimlerChrysler Corporation, Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

DaimlerChrysler Corporation (DCC)<sup>1</sup> has determined that certain model year (MY) 2007 motor vehicles do not comply with paragraph S4.3(d) of 49 CFR 571.110, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 110, *Tire Selection and Rims for Motor Vehicles With a GVWR of 4,536 Kilograms (10,000 pounds) or Less*. DCC filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports* identifying approximately 3,037 MY 2007 Dodge Dakota (Dakota) pickup trucks produced between May 8, 2006 and March 16, 2007 that do not comply with the paragraph of FMVSS No. 110 cited above.

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) and the rule implementing those provisions at 49 CFR Part 556, DCC 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. Notice of receipt of the petition was published, with a 30-day public comment period, on October 4, 2007 in the **Federal Register** (72 FR 56824). No comments were received. To view the petition and all supporting documents, log on to the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Web site at: <http://www.regulations.gov/>. Then follow the online search instructions to locate docket number "NHTSA-2007-28734."

For further information on this decision, contact Mr. John Finneran, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), telephone (202) 366-0645, facsimile (202) 366-7097.

Paragraph S4.3(d) of FMVSS No. 110 requires in pertinent part that:

S4.3 Placard. Each vehicle, except for a trailer or incomplete vehicle, shall show the

information specified in S4.3 (a) through (g), \* \* \*

(d) Tire size designation, indicated by the headings "size" or "original tire size" or "original size," and "spare tire" or "spare," for the tires installed at the time of the first purchase for purposes other than resale. For full size spare tires, the statement "see above" may, at the manufacturer's option replace the tire size designation. If no spare tire is provided, the word "none" must replace the tire size designation; \* \* \*

By way of background, DCC explains that MY 2006 Dakotas were equipped with five P265/65R17 tires—the four tires installed on the vehicle at time of sale and the spare tire. The vehicle placard on the MY 2006 Dakota accurately reflected the sizes of the tires. DCC further explained that they decided to equip the subsequent MY 2007 Dakota with P265/60R18 tires. However, prior to the actual launch of the MY 2007 vehicles, DCC discovered that a P265/60R18 tire would not fit properly in the spare tire location on the vehicle. Therefore, DCC decided to retain the P265/65R17 tire as the spare tire, while going forward with the decision to use P265/60R18 tires as in-service original equipment. Unfortunately, the vehicle placards affixed to the subject MY 2007 Dakotas were not revised to reflect the decision to use the P265/65R17 spare tire; therefore, the vehicles do not comply with S4.3(d).

DCC argues that the noncompliance, the erroneous designation of the size of the spare tire on the vehicle placard, does not have any adverse safety impact. In DCC's estimation, the P265/60R18 tire and the P265/65R17 tire are equivalent. It supports this estimation by stating that the recommended cold tire inflation pressure specified on the vehicle placard—240 kPa (35 psi)—is appropriate for either P265/60R18 or P265/65R17 tires when mounted for service on the Dakota, and that the *Tire & Rim Association Handbook* confirms that the P265/65R17 spare tire supplied with the vehicles can carry more weight at 35 psi (2,124 pounds) than the P265/60R18 tire referred to on the erroneous vehicle placard (2,064 pounds).

DCC states that all other information provided on the 2007 Dakota vehicle placard is correct.

In summation, DCC states that it has corrected the problem that caused these errors so that they will not be repeated in future production and that it believes that because the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety that no corrective action is warranted.

#### NHTSA Decision

NHTSA agrees with DCC that the erroneous designation of the size of the spare tire on the placard affixed to the

subject vehicles does not have any adverse safety implications. The intent of FMVSS No. 110 is to ensure that vehicles are equipped with tires appropriate to handle maximum vehicle loads and prevent overloading. The subject 2007 Dodge Dakota pickup trucks are equipped with four P265/60R18 tires that have a load rating of 2,064 pounds (de-rated by 1.1 when inflated to the recommended inflation pressure of 35 psi listed on the vehicle placard required by FMVSS No. 110). As required by FMVSS No. 110, these tires are appropriate for the vehicle's stated front and rear gross axle weight ratings. The same P265/60R18 tire size is listed on the placard for the spare tire. The actual spare tire provided with the vehicle is a P265/65R17. This tire has more load carrying capability, 2,124 pounds (de-rated by 1.1 at 35 psi), than the P265/60R18 tires. Both the actual provided spare tire and the spare tire indicated on the vehicle placard meet the FMVSS No. 110 loading requirements at the recommended cold inflation pressure of 35 psi. DCC is not aware of any customer complaints or field reports relating to this issue and stated that it has corrected the problem that caused these errors so that they will not be repeated in future production.

In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that DCC has met its burden of persuasion that the labeling noncompliances described are inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, DCC's petition is granted and the petitioner is exempted from the obligation of providing notification of, and a remedy for, the noncompliances under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120.

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on: February 26, 2008.

**Daniel C. Smith,**

*Associate Administrator for Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. E8-4045 Filed 2-29-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2007-28769; Notice 2]

#### Ford Motor Company, Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Ford Motor Company (Ford) has determined that approximately 180,603 seat belt replacement assemblies for 2000 through 2004 model year Ford Focus passenger cars and 191,352

<sup>1</sup> Now known as Chrysler, LLC.