

bulb check lasting approximately five seconds. According to GM, the condition will have little effect on the normal operation of the vehicle as no underlying systems are affected by the failure.

After receipt of GM's petition, NHTSA requested more information regarding the subject noncompliance. GM submitted videos showing that when the condition occurs any existing warning lights extinguish, the indicators (gauges) drop to zero, and operation of the entire instrument panel is interrupted. Specifically, any illuminated telltales extinguish for approximately one and one half seconds before a bulb check that lasts approximately five seconds is initiated. At the conclusion of the bulb check, any previously illuminated telltales will illuminate and remain illuminated.

NHTSA agrees with GM that if the instrument panel reset were to happen it would only be a momentary condition, the instrument panel telltales and indicators would extinguish and return to normal very quickly, with little, if any, impact to the driver.

GM mentioned two previous petitions that the agency granted due to the loss or failure of telltale indications. In the first petition, *General Motors Corp.; Grant of Petition for Determination of Inconsequential Noncompliance*, 56 FR 33323 (July 19, 1991), the noncompliance would only manifest itself when the headlight high beams were turned on and the cigar lighter was activated. In this situation the required high beam telltale could dim or extinguish altogether for a short period of time while the cigar lighter was being powered. The petition was granted because the agency determined there was no consequence to motor vehicle safety attached to the extinguishment of the high beam telltale.

In the second petition, submitted by Nissan, *Nissan North America, Incorporated, Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance*, 78 FR 59090, (Sept. 25, 2013), under rare circumstances the transmission gear selected was not always displayed correctly as required. The petition was granted because it was only possible for the gear indication to extinguish when the engine was inactive and the vehicle was inoperable. Upon reactivating the engine the gear indicator displayed the correct gear.

Five commenters (four individuals and the Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety) provided comments about GM's petition when NHTSA issued the notice of receipt in the **Federal Register**.

One individual stated that "there is no such potential product recall as

'inconsequential' " and that "all product recalls must be effectively enforced against the vehicle manufacturer." We note that the Motor Vehicle Safety Act requires the Secretary of Transportation to provide the vehicle manufacturers an opportunity to submit information, views, and arguments showing that a noncompliance does not impact motor vehicle safety. NHTSA is then required to consider information and arguments submitted and make a determination whether the noncompliance is, or is not, inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. If NHTSA determines that the subject noncompliance has no consequence to motor vehicle safety, the manufacturer is exempted from notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120.

The second individual commenter believes that GM should conduct a recall because the touch screen is not covered by the vehicle's warranty. The agency feels that this comment is not relevant because the steering wheel controls (rather than the touch screen on the center console) are the controls that must be used for the subject noncompliance to occur.

The two remaining individuals that provided comments believe that anything causing a distraction to the occupants of a motor vehicle under operation should be recalled. One of the commenters expressed that using a USB music device would be distracting and the other believes that the cluster becoming inoperable, even for a second, is enough time to distract the driver and cause an accident.

After reviewing the video provided by GM, the agency believes that a reset of the instrument panel would be corrected quickly within seconds, before the driver would be distracted, or realize what was happening.

The Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety does not specifically support the granting or denial of GM's petition, but believes that the existence of such a malfunction raises serious questions regarding vehicle design which can lead to this kind of situation.

Finally, GM stated that a Service Update Bulletin was issued to update the software of all IP clusters whenever any service to the affected vehicles is done at the dealership. The agency understands that GM's action to update the IP cluster software on these vehicles as they are brought in for regular service should reduce considerably the number of affected vehicles.

NHTSA'S Decision: In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that GM has met its burden of persuasion that the FMVSS No. 101 and FMVSS No. 102 noncompliance in the

affected vehicles is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, GM's petition is hereby granted and GM is not obligated to provide notification of, and a free remedy for, that noncompliance under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120.

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, this decision only applies to the subject noncompliant vehicles that GM no longer controlled at the time it determined that the noncompliance existed. However, the granting of this petition does not relieve vehicle distributors and dealers of the prohibitions on the sale, offer for sale, or introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of the noncompliant vehicles under their control after GM 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.

Jeffrey M. Giuseppe,
Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.
[FR Doc. 2016-02415 Filed 2-8-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2014-0035; Notice 2]

McLaren Automotive, Inc. (McLaren), Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

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

ACTION: Grant of petition.

SUMMARY: McLaren has determined that certain model year (MY) 2012-2015 MP4 12-C Spider and Coupe passenger cars do not fully comply with paragraph S4.4(c)(2), of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 138, *Tire Pressure Monitoring Systems*. McLaren filed a report dated February 18, 2014, pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports*. McLaren then petitioned NHTSA under 49 CFR part 556 requesting a decision that the subject

noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

ADDRESSES: For further information on this decision contact Kerrin Bressant, Office of Vehicles Safety Compliance, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), telephone (202) 366-1110, facsimile (202) 366-3081.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Overview: Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) and the rule implementing those provisions at 49 CFR part 556, McLaren submitted a petition 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.

This notice of receipt of McLaren's petition is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the petition.

II. Vehicles Involved: Affected are approximately 1,366 MY 2012–2015 MP4 12–C Spider and Coupe model passenger cars manufactured from October 10, 2011 through February 18, 2014.

III. Noncompliance: McLaren explains that during testing of the tire pressure monitoring system (TPMS) it was noted that the malfunction indicator telltale illuminated as required by FMVSS No. 138 when a malfunction is first detected with the exception of one scenario. If the malfunction is caused by an incompatible wheel sensor, when the vehicle ignition is deactivated and then reactivated to the "On" ("Run") position after a five minute period, there is no immediate re-illumination of the malfunction indicator telltale as required if the malfunction still exists. Although the malfunction indicator telltale does not re-illuminate immediately after the vehicle ignition is reactivated, it does illuminate within 40 seconds after the vehicle accelerates to, or above, 23 miles per hour (mph).

IV. Rule Text: Paragraph S4.4(c)(2) of FMVSS No. 138 requires in pertinent part:

S4.4 TPMS Malfunction.

...

(c) *Combination low tire pressure/TPMS malfunction telltale.* The vehicle meets the requirements of S4.4(a) when equipped with a combined Low Tire Pressure/TPMS malfunction telltale that:

(2) Flashes for a period of at least 60 seconds but no longer than 90 seconds upon detection of any condition specified in S4.4(a) after the ignition locking system is activated to the "On" ("Run") position. After each period of prescribed flashing, the telltale must remain continuously

illuminated as long as a malfunction exists and the ignition locking system is in the "On" ("Run") position. This flashing and illumination sequence must be repeated each time the ignition locking system is placed in the "On" ("Run") position until the situation causing the malfunction has been corrected.

...

V. Summary of McLaren's Analyses: McLaren stated its belief that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety for the following reasons:

(A) McLaren stated that although the TPMS malfunction indicator telltale will not illuminate immediately after the vehicle is restarted, it generally will illuminate shortly thereafter and in any event it will illuminate in no more than 40 seconds after the vehicle accelerates at or above 23 mph. McLaren submits that this brief pause before the malfunction indicator illuminates is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

(B) McLaren explained that if the TPMS fails to detect a signal from a compatible sensor, the TPMS indicator on the instrument cluster will display no value for the tire pressure at the affected wheel(s). A display of no value will therefore also alert the driver to the fact that something is not functioning properly.

(C) McLaren further states that with the exception of the subject noncompliance, all other aspects of the Malfunction Indicator and the TPMS in general are compliant with FMVSS No. 138.

(D) McLaren noted that it is not aware of any customer complaints related to this condition.

(E) McLaren has additionally informed NHTSA that it has corrected this noncompliance in all vehicles manufactured after February 18, 2014.

In summation, McLaren believes that the described noncompliance of the subject vehicles is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that its petition, to exempt McLaren from providing recall notification of noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30118 and remedying the recall noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30120 should be granted.

NHTSA Decision

NHTSA Analysis: McLaren explained that although the malfunction indicator telltale does not re-illuminate immediately after the vehicle is restarted, it will illuminate shortly thereafter—within 40 seconds after the vehicle speed exceeds 23 mph, and will remain illuminated for the rest of the ignition cycle.

NHTSA agrees with McLaren that the malfunction indicator telltale will not

illuminate as required only during very short periods of time when the vehicle is traveling at low speeds and thus poses little risk to motor vehicle safety. Under normal driving conditions, a driver will begin a trip by accelerating moderately beyond 23 mph, and as explained by McLaren, once the vehicle accelerates to or above 23 mph, the malfunction indicator telltale re-illuminates and then remains illuminated for the entire ignition cycle, regardless of vehicle speed. The telltale fails to re-illuminate only in the very rare case when the driver begins a trip and never exceeds 23 mph (the threshold speed necessary to re-activate the malfunction indicator telltale). No real safety risk exists because at such low speeds there is little risk of the driver losing control of the vehicle due to underinflated tires. Furthermore, the possibility that the vehicle will experience both a low inflation pressure condition and a malfunction simultaneously is highly unlikely.

McLaren stated that if the TPMS fails to detect a compatible wheel sensor, the TPMS indicator on the instrument cluster will display no value for the tire pressure at the affected wheel(s). McLaren explained that this information will help to alert the driver that some kind of system malfunction is occurring.

The agency evaluated the displays McLaren uses in the noncompliant vehicles. In addition to the combination telltale indicator lamp, the subject vehicles are equipped with a "plan view" icon which displays the pressures for all four wheels individually. If any wheel has a malfunctioning pressure sensor the indicator for that wheel displays several dashes "—" indicating there is a problem with that respective wheel. The additional information is not required by the safety standard, but can be used as an aid to the driver to determine the status of a vehicle's tires.

McLaren discussed that with the exception of the subject noncompliance, all other aspects of the TPMS functionality are compliant with the FMVSS 138 requirements. The primary functions of the TPMS, the identification of all other required malfunctions as well as the identification of low tire inflation pressure scenarios, is not affected.

The agency agrees with McLaren's reasoning with regards to the subject noncompliance involving only one aspect of the system's malfunction functionality. The primary function of the TPMS is to identify low inflation pressure conditions which McLaren's system appears to do as required by FMVSS No. 138. Also, there are a

variety of other malfunctions that can occur in addition to the incompatible tire malfunction identified in this petition. We understand from McLaren that its TPMS will perform as required during all other system malfunctions.

McLaren also mentioned that they have not received or are aware of any consumer complaints, field communications, incidences or injuries related to this noncompliance. In addition to the analysis done by McLaren that looked at customer complaints, field communications, incidents or injuries related to this condition, the agency conducted additional checks of its Office of Defects Investigations consumer complaint database and found no related complaints.

McLaren stated that they have corrected the noncompliance in all unsold vehicles manufactured after February 18, 2014, as required by NHTSA.

NHTSA'S Decision: In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA finds that McLaren has met its burden of persuasion that the subject FMVSS No. 138 noncompliance in the affected vehicles is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, McLaren's petition is hereby granted and McLaren is consequently exempted from the obligation of providing notification of, and a free remedy for, that noncompliance under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120.

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, this decision only applies to the subject noncompliant vehicles that McLaren no longer controlled at the time it determined that the noncompliance existed. However, the granting of this petition does not relieve vehicle distributors and dealers of the prohibitions on the sale, offer for sale, or introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of the noncompliant vehicles under their control after McLaren 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.

Jeffrey M. Giuseppe,
Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.
[FR Doc. 2016-02414 Filed 2-8-16; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

[Docket No. DOT-OST-2015-0194]

30-Day Notice of Application for New Information Collection Request

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary (OST), Department of Transportation (Department) or (DOT).

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Department of Transportation's (DOT) Office of the Secretary (OST) announces its plan to submit the Information Collection Request (ICR) described below to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for its review and approval and invites public comment. Executive Order 12862 directs Federal agencies to provide service to the public that matches or exceeds the best service available in the private sector. In order to work continuously to ensure that our programs are effective and meet our customers' needs, the Department of Transportation (DOT) seeks to obtain OMB approval of a generic clearance to collect feedback on our service delivery. A **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on this information collection was published on November 12, 2015 (80 FR 70077-8). The purpose of this notice is to allow for an additional 30 days of public comment.

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received by March 10, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Your comments should be identified by Docket No. DOT-OST-2015-0194 and may be submitted through one of the following methods:

- *Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for U.S. Department of Transportation, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Docket Library, Room 10102, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503*

- *email: oira_submission@omb.eop.gov.*

- *Fax: (202) 395-5806. Attention: DOT/OST Desk Officer.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Habib Azarsina, Office of the Chief

Information Officer, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC, 20590, 202-366-1965 (Voice), 202-366-7870 (Fax), or habib.azarsina@dot.gov (Email).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Generic Clearance for the Collection of Qualitative Feedback on Agency Service Delivery.

Abstract: The information collection activity will garner qualitative customer and stakeholder feedback in an efficient, timely manner, in accordance with the Department's commitment to improving service delivery. By qualitative feedback we mean information that provides useful insights on perceptions and opinions, but are not statistical surveys that yield quantitative results that can be generalized to the population of study. This feedback will provide insights into customer or stakeholder perceptions, experiences and expectations, provide an early warning of issues with service, or focus attention on areas where communication, training or changes in operations might improve delivery of products or services. These collections will allow for ongoing, collaborative and actionable communications between the Department of Transportation and its customers and stakeholders. It will also allow feedback to contribute directly to the improvement of program management. Feedback collected under this generic clearance will provide useful information, but it will not yield data that can be generalized to the overall population.

The Department will only submit a collection for approval under this generic clearance if it meets the following conditions:

- The collections are voluntary.
- The collections are low-burden for respondents (based on considerations of total burden hours, total number of respondents, or burden-hours per respondent) and are low-cost for both the respondents and the Federal Government.
- The collections are noncontroversial and do not raise issues of concern to other Federal agencies.
- Any collection is targeted to the solicitation of opinions from respondents who have experience with the program or may have experience with the program in the near future.
- Personally identifiable information (PII) is collected only to the extent necessary and is not retained.

Information gathered is intended to be used only internally for general service improvement and program management