

D&R.315 Fatigue

The structure of the UA must be shown to withstand the repeated loads expected during its service life without failure. A life limit for the airframe must be established, demonstrated by test, and included in the ICA.

D&R.320 Verification of Limits

The performance, maneuverability, stability, and control of the UA within the flight envelope described in the UA Flight Manual must be demonstrated at a minimum of 5% over maximum gross weight with no loss of control or loss of flight.

Issued in Washington, DC, on September 9, 2022.

Ian Lucas,

Manager, Policy Implementation Section,
Policy and Innovation Division, Aircraft
Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2022-20001 Filed 9-14-22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**National Highway Traffic Safety Administration**

[Docket No. NHTSA-2019-0020; Notice 2]

FCA US, LLC, Denial of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

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

ACTION: Denial of petition.

SUMMARY: FCA US, LLC, (f/k/a Chrysler Group, LLC) “FCA,” has determined that certain Mopar branded headlamp assemblies sold as aftermarket equipment and installed as original equipment in certain model year (MY) 2017–2018 Dodge Journey motor vehicles do not fully comply with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 108, *Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment*. FCA filed a noncompliance report for the replacement equipment dated March 14, 2019, and later amended it on April 9, 2019. FCA also filed a noncompliance report for the associated vehicles dated March 14, 2019, and later amended it on April 9, 2019, and April 25, 2019. FCA subsequently petitioned NHTSA (the “Agency”) on April 5, 2019, and filed a supplemental petition on May 14, 2019, for a decision that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety. This document announces the denial of FCA’s petition.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Leroy Angeles, Office of Vehicle Safety

Compliance, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), (202) 366–5304, Leroy.Angeles@dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**I. Overview**

FCA has determined that certain MY 2017–2018 Dodge Journey motor vehicles and replacement Dodge Journey headlamp assemblies do not fully comply with paragraph S8.1.11 of FMVSS No. 108, *Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment* (49 CFR 571.108). FCA filed a noncompliance report for the replacement equipment dated March 14, 2019, and later amended it on April 9, 2019. FCA also filed a noncompliance report for the associated vehicles dated March 14, 2019, and later amended it on April 9, 2019, and April 25, 2019, pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports*. FCA subsequently petitioned NHTSA on April 5, 2019, and filed a supplemental petition on May 14, 2019, for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) and 49 CFR part 556, *Exemption for Inconsequential Defect or Noncompliance*.

Notice of receipt of FCA’s petition was published with a 30-day public comment period, on February 28, 2020, in the **Federal Register** (85 FR 12059). No comments were received. To view the petition and all supporting documents, log onto the Federal Docket Management System’s (FDMS) website at <https://www.regulations.gov/>. Then follow the online search instructions to locate docket number “NHTSA-2019-0020.”

II. Equipment and Vehicles Involved

Approximately 16,604 Mopar headlamp assemblies sold as aftermarket equipment, manufactured between August 2, 2017, and July 6, 2018, are potentially involved. Approximately 84,908 MY 2017–2018 Dodge Journey motor vehicles, manufactured between August 2, 2017, and July 6, 2018, are potentially involved.

III. Noncompliance

FCA explains that its subject vehicles and equipment are noncompliant because the subject headlamp assemblies, sold as aftermarket equipment and equipped in certain MY 2017–2018 Dodge Journey motor vehicles, contain a front amber side reflex reflector that does not meet the

photometric requirements specified in paragraph S8.1.11 of FMVSS No. 108. Specifically, the reflex reflector, in the subject headlamp assemblies, does not meet the minimum photometry requirements at the observation angle of 0.2 degrees.

IV. Rule Requirements

Paragraph S8.1.11 of FMVSS No. 108 includes the requirements relevant to this petition. Each reflex reflector must be designed to conform to the photometry requirements of Table XVI–a, when tested according to the procedure in paragraph S14.2.3 of FMVSS No. 108, for the reflex reflector.

V. Summary of FCA’s Petition

The following views and arguments presented in this section, “V. Summary of FCA’s Petition,” are the views and arguments provided by FCA. They do not reflect the views of NHTSA.

FCA described the subject noncompliance and stated that the noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety. FCA submitted the following views and arguments in support of its petition:

1. FCA cites a prior NHTSA decision¹ on a petition for inconsequential noncompliance and quotes NHTSA, in part, as stating: “For the purposes of FMVSS No. 108, the primary function of a reflex reflector is to prevent crashes by permitting early detection of an unlighted motor vehicle at an intersection or when parked on or by the side of the road.”²

2. Per FCA, the reflex reflectors on the subject vehicles “perform adequately to meet the safety purpose of the standard because they permit the early detection of an unlighted motor vehicle at an intersection or when parked, notwithstanding their deviation from certain photometric requirements.”

3. FCA believes that “the failure of these reflex reflectors to meet the photometric requirements does not reduce their effectiveness in providing the necessary visibility for oncoming vehicles and that the difference between the reflectivity provided by a compliant reflector is not distinguishable from the reflectivity provided by a noncompliant reflector.” FCA compared the performance of two Dodge Journey vehicles, one equipped with a compliant front side reflex reflector and the other a noncompliant front side reflex reflector parked front end-to-front end across a road’s surface. Observers

¹ See DRV, LLC, Denial of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance; 82 FR 24204, May 25, 2017.

² Emphasis added by FCA.

used a different vehicle's headlamps as a source of illumination to evaluate the luminous intensity of each front side reflex reflector; that source of illumination was located 100 feet (30.5 meters) away from the two Dodge Journey vehicles. FCA chose an illumination distance of 100 feet (30.5 meters) because that is the same distance specified in FMVSS No. 108 for testing reflex reflectors using a goniometer in a photometric laboratory.

4. With regard to FCA's evaluation, FCA chose vehicles with varying mounting heights, which included a 2019 Jeep Cherokee with LED projector headlamps, a 2019 Ram 1500 Pickup Truck with LED reflector headlamps, and a 2019 Alfa Romeo Giulia with Bi-Xenon projector headlamps as sources of illumination. Sixteen FCA employees (and only eight for the Alfa Romeo tests) volunteered as evaluators and stood immediately in front of, and at the centerline of, the vehicles whose headlamps were being used as the source of illumination. None of the evaluators were able to distinguish any luminous intensity differences in the light being reflected in any of the scenarios. FCA believes that these vehicles cover the range of typical headlamp mounting heights for vehicles on the road today.

VI. NHTSA's Analysis

The burden of establishing the inconsequentiality of a failure to comply with a *performance requirement* in a standard—as opposed to a *labeling requirement*—is more substantial and difficult to meet. Accordingly, the Agency has not found many such noncompliances inconsequential.³ Potential performance failures of safety-critical equipment, like seat belts or air bags, are rarely deemed inconsequential.

An important issue to consider in determining inconsequentiality based upon NHTSA's prior decisions on noncompliance issues is the safety risk to individuals who experience the type of event against which the recall would otherwise protect.⁴ NHTSA also does

not consider the absence of complaints or injuries to show that the issue is inconsequential to safety. "Most importantly, the absence of a complaint does not mean there have not been any safety issues, nor does it mean that there will not be safety issues in the future."⁵ "[T]he fact that in past reported cases good luck and swift reaction have prevented many serious injuries does not mean that good luck will continue to work."⁶

The primary function of a reflex reflector is to prevent crashes by permitting early detection of an unlighted motor vehicle at an intersection or when parked on or by the side of a road. The purpose of these reflectors is to accurately depict the size of a vehicle when parked or disabled in the dark, which minimizes the risk of motor vehicle crashes.

The subject reflex reflectors failed 5 out of the 10 required test points where the photometry measurements were, at best, 68.6% below the minimum requirement. In other words, at specific test points, the reflex reflectors provide less than one-third of the illuminance that a compliant reflex reflector provides (*i.e.*, a reflex reflector which meets the minimum safety standard).

NHTSA does not find FCA's subjective evaluation described above sufficiently compelling to grant this petition. FCA's evaluation attempts to show that the average human eye cannot discern a difference in the luminous intensity between FCA's noncompliant reflectors and other compliant reflectors that meet the minimum safety standard. However, FCA's evaluation was limited to occupants standing no more than 100 feet from the test vehicles, and only at certain angles. While FMVSS No. 108 specifies a measurement distance for reflex reflector photometry of 100 feet, real world performance is not limited to a static distance measurement established in a minimum safety standard. For these reasons, NHTSA does not believe that FCA's subjective evaluation is sufficient to support a determination of inconsequential noncompliance.

As previously stated, the subject reflex reflectors failed by a significant margin to meet the minimum safety

than occupant using similar compliant light source).

⁵ *Morgan 3 Wheeler Limited; Denial of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance*, 81 FR 21663, 21666 (Apr. 12, 2016).

⁶ *United States v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 565 F.2d 754, 759 (D.C. Cir. 1977) (finding defect poses an unreasonable risk when it "results in hazards as potentially dangerous as sudden engine fire, and where there is no dispute that at least some such hazards, in this case fires, can definitely be expected to occur in the future").

requirement at multiple required test points. Compared to a reflex reflector that meets the minimum safety standard, the subject reflex reflectors, at some test points, provided less than one-third of the required illuminance of a compliant reflex reflector. Therefore, NHTSA's evaluation of consequentiality of the subject noncompliance is based, in part, on NHTSA's determination that the performance failure of the subject reflex reflectors deviates to such a significant degree that it would be noticeable to drivers of other motor vehicles. Consequently, the subject noncompliance creates a risk to motor vehicle safety.

Another factor considered in the evaluation of this petition is a NHTSA study on the effectiveness of side marker lamps,⁷ which showed that the addition of side marker lamps prevents 106,000 accidents, 93,000 nonfatal injuries and \$347 million in property damage annually. While this study only relates to side marker lamps, the benefits are similar for reflex reflectors. Reflex reflectors aid in the visibility of parked or unlighted motor vehicles at night and are often mounted in the same or similar location as side marker lamps, and therefore, a performance failure of a reflex reflector is also consequential to motor vehicle safety due to reduced visibility for drivers of other vehicles.

In summary, given the magnitude of the performance failure of the subject reflex reflectors, the subject reflex reflectors create a risk that drivers of other vehicles will not detect a parked and unlighted motor vehicle early enough to avoid a vehicle crash. Consequently, NHTSA has determined that the subject noncompliance creates a risk to motor vehicle safety by failing to prevent motor vehicle crashes, which was the purpose of NHTSA's FMVSS No. 108 standard. See 49 CFR 571.108, S2.

VII. NHTSA's Decision

In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA finds that FCA has not met its burden of persuasion that the subject FMVSS No. 108 noncompliance of the affected equipment and vehicles is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, FCA's petition is hereby denied. FCA is consequently obligated to provide notification of, and a free remedy for, that noncompliance, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120.

⁷ See *An Evaluation of Side Marker Lamps for Cars, Trucks and Buses*, DOT HS-806-430 (July 1983). <https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/806430>.

³ Cf. *Gen. Motors Corporation; Ruling on Petition for Determination of Inconsequential Noncompliance*, 69 FR 19897, 19899 (Apr. 14, 2004) (citing prior cases where noncompliance was expected to be imperceptible, or nearly so, to vehicle occupants or approaching drivers).

⁴ See *Gen. Motors, LLC; Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance*, 78 FR 35355 (June 12, 2013) (finding noncompliance had no effect on occupant safety because it had no effect on the proper operation of the occupant classification system and the correct deployment of an air bag); *Osram Sylvania Prods. Inc.; Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance*, 78 FR 46000 (July 30, 2013) (finding occupant using noncompliant light source would not be exposed to significantly greater risk

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

Anne L. Collins,
Associate Administrator for Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 2022-19994 Filed 9-14-22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of the Comptroller of the Currency

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Securities Exchange Act Disclosure Rules

AGENCY: Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice and request for comment; correction.

SUMMARY: The OCC, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites comment on a continuing information collection as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA). In accordance with the requirements of the PRA, the OCC may not conduct or sponsor, and respondents are not required to respond to, an information collection unless it displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. The OCC is soliciting comment concerning the renewal of its information collection titled "Securities Exchange Act Disclosure Rules." OCC also gives notice that it has sent the collection to OMB for review.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before October 17, 2022

ADDRESSES: Commenters are encouraged to submit comments by email, if possible. You may submit comments by any of the following methods:

- Email: prainfo@occ.treas.gov.
- Mail: Chief Counsel's Office,

Attention: Comment Processing, 1557-0106, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, 400 7th Street SW, Suite 3E-218, Washington, DC 20219.

- Hand Delivery/Courier: 400 7th Street SW, Suite 3E-218, Washington, DC 20219.

- Fax: (571) 465-4326.

Instructions: You must include "OCC" as the agency name and "1557-0106" in your comment. In general, the OCC will publish comments on www.reginfo.gov without change, including any business or personal information provided, such as name and address information, email addresses, or phone numbers. Comments received,

including attachments and other supporting materials, are part of the public record and subject to public disclosure. Do not include any information in your comment or supporting materials that you consider confidential or inappropriate for public disclosure.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should also be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain. You can find this particular information collection by selecting "Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments" or by using the search function.

On May 23, 2022, the OCC published a 60-day notice for this information collection, 87 FR 31298. You may review comments and other related materials that pertain to this information collection following the close of the 30-day comment period for this notice by the method set forth in the next bullet.

- Viewing Comments Electronically: Go to www.reginfo.gov. Hover over the "Information Collection Review" tab and click on "Information Collection Review" from the drop-down menu. From the "Currently under Review" drop-down menu, select "Department of Treasury" and then click "submit." This information collection can be located by searching by OMB control number "1557-0106" or "Securities Exchange Act Disclosure Rules." Upon finding the appropriate information collection, click on the related "ICR Reference Number." On the next screen, select "View Supporting Statement and Other Documents" and then click on the link to any comment listed at the bottom of the screen.

- For assistance in navigating www.reginfo.gov, please contact the Regulatory Information Service Center at (202) 482-7340.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Shaquita Merritt, Clearance Officer, (202) 649-5490, Chief Counsel's Office, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, 400 7th Street SW, Suite 3E-218, Washington, DC 20219. If you are deaf, hard of hearing, or have a speech disability, please dial 7-1-1 to access telecommunications relay services.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the PRA (44 U.S.C. 3501-3520), Federal agencies must obtain approval from the OMB for each collection of information that they conduct or sponsor. "Collection of information" is defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(3) and 5 CFR 1320.3(c) to include agency requests or requirements that members of the public

submit reports, keep records, or provide information to a third party. The OCC asks that OMB extend its approval of the collection in this notice.

Title: Securities Exchange Act Disclosure Rules.

OMB Control No.: 1557-0106.

Abstract: This submission covers an existing regulation and involves no change to the regulation or to the information collection requirements. The OCC requests only that OMB approve its revised burden estimates.

The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) is required by statute to collect, in accordance with its regulations, certain information and documents from any firm that is required to register its stock with the SEC.¹ Federal law requires the OCC to apply similar regulations to any national bank or Federal savings association similarly required to be registered with the SEC (generally those with a class of equity securities held by 2,000 or more shareholders).²

12 CFR part 11 ensures that a national bank or Federal savings association whose securities are subject to registration provides adequate information about its operations to current and potential shareholders and the public. The OCC reviews the information to ensure that it complies with Federal law and makes public all information required to be filed under the rule.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Individuals; Businesses or other for-profit.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 44.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 332.02 hours.

On May 23, 2022, the OCC published a 60-day notice for this information collection, 87 FR 31298. No comments were received. Comments continue to be invited on:

(a) Whether the information collections are necessary for the proper performance of the OCC's functions, including whether the information has practical utility;

(b) The accuracy of the OCC's estimates of the burden of the information collections, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(c) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected;

(d) Ways to minimize the burden of information collections on respondents,

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78m(a)(1).

² 15 U.S.C. 78l(i).