

III. Decision To Grant the Petition

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 33106 and 49 CFR 543.8(b), the agency grants a petition for exemption from the parts-marking requirements of part 541, either in whole or in part, if it determines that, based upon substantial evidence, the standard equipment antitheft device is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of part 541. The agency finds that Ford has provided adequate reasons for its belief that the antitheft device for its vehicle line is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standard. This conclusion is based on the information Ford provided about its antitheft device. NHTSA believes, based on Ford's supporting evidence, that the antitheft device described for its vehicle line is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standard.

The agency concludes that Ford's antitheft device will provide four types of performance features listed in section 543.6(a)(3): Promoting activation; preventing defeat or circumvention of the device by unauthorized persons; preventing operation of the vehicle by unauthorized entrants; and ensuring the reliability and durability of the device.

The agency notes that 49 CFR part 541, Appendix A-1, identifies those lines that are exempted from the theft prevention standard for a given model year. 49 CFR 543.8(f) contains publication requirements incident to the disposition of all part 543 petitions. Advanced listing, including the release of future product nameplates, the beginning model year for which the petition is granted and a general description of the antitheft device is necessary in order to notify law enforcement agencies of new vehicle lines exempted from the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standard.

If Ford decides not to use the exemption for its requested vehicle line, the manufacturer must formally notify the agency. If such a decision is made, the line must be fully marked as required by 49 CFR 541.5 and 541.6 (marking of major component parts and replacement parts).

NHTSA notes that if Ford wishes in the future to modify the device on which this exemption is based, the company may have to submit a petition to modify the exemption. Section

543.8(d) states that a part 543 exemption applies only to vehicles that belong to a line exempted under this part and equipped with the antitheft device on which the line's exemption is based. Further, section 543.10(c)(2) provides for the submission of petitions "to modify an exemption to permit the use of an antitheft device similar to but differing from the one specified in the exemption."

The agency wishes to minimize the administrative burden that section 543.10(c)(2) could place on exempted vehicle manufacturers and itself. The agency did not intend in drafting part 543 to require the submission of a modification petition for every change to the components or design of an antitheft device. The significance of many such changes could be de minimis. Therefore, NHTSA suggests that if Ford contemplates making any changes, the effects of which might be characterized as de minimis, it should consult the agency before preparing and submitting a petition to modify.

For the foregoing reasons, the agency hereby grants in full Ford's petition for exemption for the confidential vehicle line from the parts-marking requirements of 49 CFR part 541, beginning with its MY 2022 vehicles.

Issued under authority delegated in 49 CFR 1.95 and 501.8.

Raymond R. Posten,

Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 2021-18421 Filed 8-25-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket Number NHTSA-2021-0058]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Notice and Request for Comments; Event Data Recorders

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

ACTION: Notice and request for comments on a request for approval.

SUMMARY: NHTSA invites public comments about our intention to request approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for an information collection currently in use. Before a Federal agency can collect certain information from the public, it must receive approval from OMB. Under procedures established by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before seeking OMB approval, Federal

agencies must solicit public comment on proposed collections of information, including extensions and reinstatements of previously approved collections. This document describes a collection of information on event data recorders (EDRs) for which NHTSA intends to seek OMB approval. The information collection currently does not have an OMB control number.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted by October 25, 2021.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments [identified by Docket No. NHTSA-2021-0058] through one of the following methods:

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

- *Fax:* 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. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call 202-366-9322 before coming.

Instructions: All submissions must include the agency name and docket number for this notice. 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) or you may visit <https://www.transportation.gov/privacy>.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to <http://www.regulations.gov> or the street address listed above. Follow the online instructions for accessing the dockets via internet.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or access to background documents, contact Carla Rush, NHTSA, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, West Building, Room W43-417, NRM-100, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone number: 202-366-1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), before an agency submits a proposed collection of

information to OMB for approval, it must first publish a document in the **Federal Register** providing a 60-day comment period and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information. The OMB has promulgated regulations describing what must be included in such a document. Under OMB's regulation (at 5 CFR 1320.8(d)), an agency must ask for public comment on the following: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) how to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) how to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g. permitting electronic submission of responses. In compliance with these requirements, NHTSA asks for public comments on the following proposed collection of information for which the agency is seeking approval from OMB.

Title: Event Data Recorders.

OMB Control Number: New.

Type of Request: Approval of an existing collection in use without an OMB Control Number.

Type of Review Requested: Regular.

Requested Expiration Date of

Approval: Three years from the date of approval.

Summary of the Collection of Information: 49 CFR part 563, Event Data Recorders, specifies uniform, national requirements for vehicles voluntarily equipped with EDRs concerning the collection, storage, and retrievability of onboard motor vehicle crash event data. More specifically it requires voluntarily installed EDRs in vehicles with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of 3,855 kilograms (8,500 pounds) or less to:

- Record 15 essential data elements;
- Record up to 30 additional data elements if the vehicle is equipped to record these elements;
- Record these data elements in a standardized format, with specifications for range, accuracy, resolution, sampling rate, recording duration, and filter class;
- Function after full-scale vehicle crash tests specified in FMVSS Nos. 208 and 214; and

- Have the capacity to record two events in a multi-event crash.

In addition, Part 563 requires vehicle manufacturers to make a retrieval tool for the EDR information commercially available, and include a standardized statement in the owner's manual indicating that the vehicle is equipped with an EDR and describing its purpose. Part 563 helps ensure that EDRs record, in a readily usable manner, data valuable for effective crash investigations and for analysis of safety equipment performance (e.g., advanced restraint systems).

Description of the Need for the Information and Use of the Information: Under 49 U.S.C. 322(a), the Secretary of Transportation (the "Secretary") is authorized to prescribe regulations to carry out the duties and powers of the Secretary. One of the duties of the Secretary is to administer the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, as amended. The Secretary has delegated the responsibility for carrying out the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act to NHTSA.¹ Two statutory provisions, 49 U.S.C. 30182 and 23 U.S.C. 403, authorize NHTSA to collect motor vehicle crash data to support its safety mission. NHTSA collects motor vehicle crash information under these authorities to support its statutory mandate to establish motor vehicle safety standards and reduce the occurrence and cost of traffic crashes.² NHTSA also utilizes crash data in the enforcement of motor vehicle safety recalls and other motor vehicle highway safety programs that reduce fatalities, injuries, and property damage caused by motor vehicle crashes. In 2006, NHTSA exercised its general authority to issue such rules and regulations as deemed necessary to carry out Chapter 301 of Title 49, United States Code to promulgate 49 CFR part 563.³

NHTSA issued part 563 to improve crash data collection by standardizing data recorded on EDRs to help provide a better understanding of the circumstances in which crashes and injuries occur, which will in turn lead to the development of safer vehicle designs. EDR data are used to improve the quality of crash data collection to assist safety researchers, vehicle manufacturers, and the agency in crash investigations to understand vehicle crashes better and more precisely. Similarly, vehicle manufacturers are able to utilize EDRs in improving vehicle designs and developing more

effective vehicle safety countermeasures, and EDR data may be used by Advanced Automatic Crash Notification (AACN) systems to aid emergency response teams in assessing the severity of a crash and estimating the probability of serious injury.

Additionally, the agency's experience in handling unintended acceleration and pedal entrapment allegations has demonstrated that, if a vehicle is equipped with an EDR, the data from that EDR can improve the ability of both the agency and the vehicle's manufacturer to identify and address safety concerns associated with possible defects in the design or performance of the vehicle.

Description of the Likely Respondents: The respondents are manufacturers that voluntarily equip passenger cars, multipurpose passenger vehicles, trucks, and buses having a GVWR of 3,855 kg (8,500 pounds) or less and an unloaded vehicle weight of 2,495 kg (5,500 pounds) with EDRs. The agency estimates that there are approximately 18 such manufacturers.

Estimate Total Annual Burden Hours: NHTSA estimates that there are no annual reporting or recordkeeping burdens associated with Part 563, except for the owner's manual statement requirement which will be incorporated into the consolidated owner's manual requirements information collection (OMB Control Number 2127-0541). Vehicle manufacturers are not required to retain or report information gathered by EDRs because the devices themselves continuously monitor vehicle systems and determine when to record, retain, and/or overwrite information. The information is collected automatically by electronic means. Data are only required to be locked and cannot be overwritten when a recordable event occurs (e.g., an air bag deploys in a crash event). When recordable events do occur, EDRs only capture data for a few seconds. NHTSA estimates that there is no annual hourly burden associated with the information standardization requirements of part 563.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Cost: In the August 2006 final rule, the agency estimated that the costs associated with the final rule were negligible. Several factors contributed to this determination. First, NHTSA estimated that about 64 percent of new light vehicles in 2005 already added the EDR capability to the vehicles' existing air bag control systems. Thus, the EDRs were simply capturing information that was already being processed by the vehicle. Additionally, in the final rule the agency sought to limit the number of EDR data elements and associated

¹ 49 U.S.C. 105 and 322; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.95.

² See 49 U.S.C. 30101 and 30111.

³ 71 FR 50997, August 28, 2006.

requirements to the minimum necessary to achieve our stated purposes. At that time, NHTSA determined that the industry's current state-of-the-art EDRs largely met the purposes of part 563. Thus, it was unnecessary to specify requirements for additional sensors or other hardware that would increase EDR costs appreciably. NHTSA stated in the final rule that the most significant technology cost could result from the need to upgrade data storage.

The cost of data storage, long-term or short-term, has drastically reduced over the years.⁴ Regardless of the storage type, costs are now a fraction of what they were even 10 years ago.⁵ A recent study from NHTSA looking at EDR technologies reported that information provided by industry indicated that a typical recorded event requires about 2 kilobytes (Kb) of memory depending on the manufacturer.⁶ Information from manufacturers also indicated that the typical microprocessor used in vehicle applications, in approximately the 2013 timeframe, had 32 Kb or 64 Kb of flash data as part of the air bag control module (ACM) and that only a fraction of the memory is dedicated to the EDR data. This study also estimated the total memory usage for all Table I and Table II data elements, listed at 49 CFR 563.7, recorded for the minimum required duration and frequency requirements in part 563. It reported that to record Table I and II data elements would require 0.072 Kb and 0.858 Kb of memory storage, respectively.

In addition, NHTSA now estimates that 99.5 percent of model year 2021 light vehicles have a compliant EDR, meaning manufacturers have largely already incurred the cost of meeting the part 563 requirements. Given that EDRs are installed on nearly all new light vehicles, the large amount of storage that is part of the air bag control module (32 kb or 64 kb), the small fraction required for EDR data (<1 kb), and the negligible costs for data storage, NHTSA continues to believe that there would be no additional costs or negligible costs associated with the Part 563 requirements. Therefore, the cost burden for this collection of information is discussed qualitatively.

Part 563 only applies to vehicles voluntarily-equipped with EDRs. Therefore, any burden is based on the differences in cost between a compliant

and non-compliant EDR. In considering additional burden for compliant EDRs, NHTSA considered: (1) The additional burden of meeting the 10-day data crash survivability requirement; and (2) the additional burden of meeting the data format requirements. Part 563 requires that an EDR must function during and after the compliance tests specified in FMVSS Nos. 208 and 214. The EDR's stored data is required to be downloadable 10 days after the crash tests. This requirement provides a basic functioning and survivability level for EDRs, but does not ensure that EDRs survive extremely severe crashes, fire, or fluid immersion. The burden for data survivability can include costs for an additional power supply and enhancements for computer area network (CAN) such as wiring, data bus, and harness. However, before part 563 was established the agency had not documented an EDR survivability problem except in rare and extremely severe events such as fire and submergence. Thus, the agency does not believe vehicle manufacturers incur additional costs to comply with the ability to retrieve the essential data elements 10 days after the crash test.

With regard to the memory capacity required to meet the part 563 data requirements, due to proprietary concerns, the adequacy of existing memory capacity of part 563 non-compliant vehicles is not known. However, we believe that the part 563 requirements are comparable to the current industry EDR practices. In terms of the burden associated with software algorithm changes to meet the data format requirements, the agency believes that, in the event a vehicle manufacturer needs to redesign their software algorithm, the redesign would be minor (e.g., changing the specifications in their codes). The agency estimates that the cost of algorithm redesign would be negligible on a per vehicle basis and it would be an upfront cost (i.e., not a recurring burden).

Public Comments Invited: You are asked to comment on any aspects of this information collection, including (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Department's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of

automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Authority: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995; 44 U.S.C. chapter 35, as amended; 49 CFR 1.49; and DOT Order 1351.29.

R. Ryan Posten,

*Associate Administrator for Rulemaking,
National Highway Traffic Safety
Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2021-18420 Filed 8-25-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2020-0107; Notice 2]

Notice of Denial of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming Model Year 2014-2018 Chevrolet Cheyenne Trucks Are Eligible for Importation

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

ACTION: Denial of petition for determination of import eligibility.

SUMMARY: Diversified Vehicle Services, Inc. (DVS or Petitioner) has petitioned NHTSA for a decision that model year (MY) 2014-2018 Chevrolet Cheyenne Trucks (TKs), which were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards (FMVSS), are eligible for importation into the United States. In its petition, DVS claims that these vehicles are eligible for import because they are substantially similar to Chevrolet Silverado TKs originally manufactured for sale in the United States and certified by their manufacturer as complying with all applicable FMVSS, and because they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards. This document announces the denial of DVS's petition.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Mazurowski, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202-366-1012).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

A motor vehicle that was not originally manufactured to conform to all applicable FMVSS may be eligible for import into the United States if NHTSA determines that the motor vehicle is: (1) Substantially similar to a motor vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and certified for sale in the United States, (2) of the same model year as the model of the motor

⁴ <https://www.computerworld.com/article/3182207/cw50-data-storage-goes-from-1m-to-2-cents-per-gigabyte.html>

⁵ <https://hblk.net/blog/posts/2017/12/17/historical-cost-of-computer-memory-and-storage-4/>

⁶ DOT HS 812 929, <https://www.nhtsa.gov/document/light-vehicle-event-data-recorder-technologies>