those companies. The Agency monitors the safety of the affiliated carriers through SMS and will take action on those carriers, as appropriate.

To date, no carriers have failed the PASA. The Act only requires publication of data for carriers receiving operating authority, as failure to successfully complete the PASA precludes the carrier from being granted authority to participate in the long-haul pilot program. FMCSA will publish this information to show motor carriers that failed to meet U.S. safety standards.

Request for Comments

In accordance with the Act, FMCSA requests public comment from all interested persons on the PASA information presented in this notice. All comments received before the close of business on the comment closing date indicated at the beginning of this notice will be considered and will be available for examination in the docket at the location listed under the ADDRESSES section of this notice. Comments received after the comment closing date will be filed in the public docket and will be considered to the extent practicable. In addition to late comments, the FMCSA will also continue to file, in the public docket, relevant information that becomes available after the comment closing date. Interested persons should continue to examine the public docket for new material.

FMCSA notes that under its regulations, preliminary grants of authority, pending the carrier's showing of compliance with insurance and process agent requirements and the resolution of any protests, are publically noticed through publication in the FMCSA Register. Any protests of such grants must be filed within 10 days of publication of notice in the FMCSA Register.

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. [FR Doc. 2012–19564 Filed 8–8–12; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2012-0006; Notice 1]

General Motors, LLC, Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Receipt of Petition.

SUMMARY: General Motors, LLC (GM) ¹ has determined that certain model year 2012; Cadillac SRX, Chevrolet Equinox, GMC Terrain and Saab 9–4x multipurpose passenger vehicles, and Chevrolet Cruze passenger cars, do not fully comply with paragraph S19.2.2 of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 208, *Occupant Crash Protection.* GM has filed an appropriate report dated September 6, 2011, pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports.*

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) (see implementing rule at 49 CFR part 556), GM 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 GM'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.

Vehicles involved: approximately 3,599 Cadillac SRX, 11,459 Chevrolet Equinox, 5,080 GMC Terrain and 24 Saab 9–4x multipurpose passenger vehicles; and 27,392 Chevrolet Cruze passenger cars. All of the vehicles are model year 2012 and were manufactured within the period from April 6, 2011 through August 20, 2011.

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, these provisions only apply to the subject 47,554² model year vehicles that GM no longer controlled at the time it determined that the noncompliance existed.

Noncompliance: GM explains that the noncompliance is that on rare occasions, the air bag suppression telltale on the subject vehicles may remain illuminated during a particular ignition cycle and indicate that the passenger air bag is OFF regardless of whether the air bag is or is not suppressed.

GM further explains that for this noncompliance condition to exist, the following must occur:

(1) The engine must be restarted within approximately 24 seconds of having been turned OFF;

(2) The key ³ must be turned rapidly, spending less than 10 milliseconds (0.01 seconds) in the RUN position before it reaches the START position; and

(3) The crank power mode (approximately how long the starter motor runs) must be less than 1.2 seconds. GM's data predicts that the conditions for a noncompliance to occur will happen, on average, approximately once every 18 months, independent of whether the front seat is occupied or not.

Rule text: Paragraph S19 of FMVSS No. 208 requires in pertinent part:

S19 Requirements to provide protection for infants in rear facing and convertible child restraints and car beds.

S19.1 Each vehicle certified as complying with S14 shall, at the option of the manufacturer, meet the requirements specified in S19.2 or S19.3, under the test procedures specified in S20.

S19.2 Option 1—Automatic suppression feature. Each vehicle shall meet the requirements specified in S19.2.1 through S19.2.3. * * *

S19.2.2 The vehicle shall be equipped with at least one telltale which emits light whenever the passenger air bag system is deactivated and does not emit light whenever the passenger air bag system is activated, except that the telltale(s) need not illuminate when the passenger seat is unoccupied. Each telltale: * * *

(h) The telltale must not emit light except when the passenger air bag is turned off or during a bulb check upon vehicle starting.

Summary of GM's Analysis and Arguments

GM stated its belief that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety for the following reasons:

A. The noncompliance does not increase the risk to motor vehicle safety because it has no effect on occupant restraint. The noncompliant condition has absolutely no effect on the proper operation of the occupant classification system. If the telltale error occurs when

¹General Motors, LLC, is a manufacturer of motor vehicles and is registered under the laws of the state of Michigan.

² GM's petition, which was filed under 49 CFR part 556, requests an agency decision to exempt GM as a motor vehicles manufacturer from the notification and recall responsibilities of 49 CFR part 573 for the 47,554 affected vehicles. However, a decision on this petition cannot relieve vehicle distributors and dealers of the prohibitions on the sale, offer for sale, introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of the noncompliant vehicles under their control after GM notified them that the subject noncompliance existed.

³Cadillac SRX and Saab 9–4X vehicles have a push button start/stop switch.

an occupant or a Child Restraint System (CRS) is in the front passenger seat, the occupant classification system will operate as designed, and will enable or disable the air bag, as intended, and continue to meet the requirements of FMVSS No. 208 in all other regards. As a result, all occupants will continue to receive the benefit of the air bag when they otherwise would, regardless of whether or not the telltale is operating properly during a particular ignition cycle.

B. The noncompliance condition is an extremely remote event. The noncompliance condition will not occur unless the engine is shut off and restarted within about 24 seconds. Even then, the condition will not occur unless the ignition key spends less than a hundredth of a second in the RUN position before reaching the START position, and the crank power mode lasts less than 1.2 seconds. These are very prescribed, unusual conditions. GM discovered the condition during an assembly plant end of line audit when it was noted that the telltale illuminated OFF when an adult passenger was present. GM is not aware of any reports in the field about the condition.

When this condition occurs, it sets a Diagnostic Trouble Code (DTC) that is stored in history in the sensing diagnostic module for 100 ignition cycles. GM reviewed its test fleet experience for the subject vehicles, and determined that the conditions needed to produce the telltale error will occur on average once every 535 days, or approximately, once every 18 months regardless of whether the front passenger seat is occupied or not.

C. Even if the air bag was enabled when the telltale indicated it was disabled, that would be extremely unlikely to increase the risk to motor vehicle safety. A potential safety risk could exist if the telltale indicated the air bag was OFF when the air bag was actually ON and a small child or CRS was placed in the front passenger seat. As explained in more detail below, this is extremely unlikely to occur in the present case. Parents and caregivers are warned to properly restrain small children and CRSs in the rear seat, and field data shows small children and CRSs are generally not placed in the front seat. In addition, GM has conducted significant testing to help assure that the air bag suppression system will properly disable the air bag system for small children and CRSs, as designed.

1. Children and CRSs generally are not placed in the front seat. It is very unlikely that a small child or a CRS would be placed in the front seat since parents and caregivers are routinely advised by NHTSA, pediatricians, child safety advocacy groups, and public service messages to properly restrain them in the rear seat. As NHTSA states in its Child Safety Recommendations for All Ages, "All children under 13 should ride in the back seat."

In addition, the label on the vehicle's sun visor warns against placing a rear facing infant seat in the front passenger seat, and the owner's manual warns against placing children in the front seat, as well, even for vehicles equipped with a passenger sensing system.

Publicly available data confirms that parents and caregivers generally do not place small children in the front passenger seat. According to GM's calculations using National Accident Sampling System (NASS) data, six month old, three year old and six year old children collectively are likely to occupy the front passenger seat during less than one half of one percent of all trips. This fact, together with the infrequency with which the noncompliance condition occurs, makes it extremely unlikely that a child or CRS would be placed in the front seat when the conditions needed to produce the telltale error occur.

2. Even if a small child or CRS was in the front seat. GM has conducted extensive testing to help assure that the air bag suppression system will properly characterize these occupants, so that the air bag will be suppressed, as designed. GM has had significant field experience with suppression systems of the type used in the subject vehicles. GM has used pattern recognition based suppression systems since 2005 and capacitance based suppression systems since 2009.

GM has conducted over 15,000 tests of the suppression systems in the subject vehicles, based on FMVSS 208 as well as GM's own internal requirements, to judge performance for properly positioned as well as out of position occupants and CRSs. In each of the over 10,000 tests involving the systems in the Cruze, Equinox, Terrain and Saab 9–4X vehicles, the suppression system properly characterized the occupant or CRS and enabled or disabled the air bag system, as appropriate. The same is true in the vast majority of SRX tests.

In over 5,000 of GM's SRX tests, the air bag system was enabled or disabled as desired. In just four of GM's internal (non-FMVSS) SRX tests involving three year old dummies in a particular forward facing CRSs, the suppression system enabled the air bag. In each of these tests, the CRS was installed over a 10 mm thick blanket. These tests have no significant bearing on the present risk analysis, since more than 98 percent of the tests involving a three year old dummy in a forward-facing CRS classified correctly, and in each of the discrepant tests, the CRS would classify correctly when installed without the blanket.

There was not a single discrepancy in the over 10,000 tests involving the Cruze, Equinox, Terrain and Saab 9–4X vehicles, representing over 92 percent of the subject vehicle population. In addition, in over 99.8 percent of the SRX tests with CRSs or occupants, the air bag system was enabled or disabled, as desired, and in the remainder of the CRS tests, the air bag system was properly suppressed when the CRS was installed according to the CRS manufacturer's instructions.

The very low rate at which the conditions needed to produce the telltale error occur, coupled with the very low chance that a small child or CRS would be located in the front seat at that time, makes the potential for any safety consequence extremely small. That potential is reduced even further since it is extremely unlikely that the noncompliance condition would occur at that same time that a CRS is being installed in the vehicle, for the first time. Anyone who used such a restraint, would in all probability, have received numerous AIR BAG ON telltale illuminations before and after the infrequent noncompliant OFF illumination, and would have moved the CRS to a rear seating location or modified the installation accordingly.

GM concludes by stating that the telltale error at issue in this petition does not increase the risk to motor vehicle safety because it has no effect on occupant restraint. The air bag classification system will continue to characterize the front seat occupants and enable or disable the air bag, as designed. In addition, the noncompliance condition will rarely occur. For the error to occur at all, the vehicle must be restarted—in a very particular manner—within less than half of one minute of having been turned off. The conditions needed to produce the telltale error are estimated to occur approximately once every 18 months. The potential for any consequence to result is further reduced by the fact that the front seat is occupied only about a quarter of the time, and by small children and CRSs, much more infrequently. Parental and caregiver education and information in the vehicle owner's manuals and labels warn against placing infants, children and CRSs in the front seat, and NASS data bears out that small children and

CRSs are placed in the front less than one percent of the time. More importantly, GM has conducted more than 10,000 tests confirming that the air bag system in over 93 percent of the subject vehicles will properly characterize occupants and CRSs, so that the air bag will or will not be suppressed, as appropriate. With respect to the remaining vehicles, the air bag system was enabled or disabled, as desired, over 99.8 percent of the time in GM's testing. Even so, the chance that a CRS would be installed in the front seat for the first time, at the same time that the noncompliance occurred, would be even more remote. GM has additionally informed NHTSA that it has corrected the noncompliance so that all future production vehicles will comply with FMVSS No. 208.

In summation, GM believes that the described noncompliance of its vehicles is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that its petition, to exempt 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.

Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on this petition. Comments must refer to the docket and notice number cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted by any of the following methods:

a. *By mail addressed to:* U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.

b. *By hand delivery to:* U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. except Federal Holidays.

c. *Electronically:* by logging onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Web site at *http:// www.regulations.gov/.* Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Comments may also be faxed to 1–202– 493–2251.

Comments must be written in the English language, and be no greater than 15 pages in length, although there is no limit to the length of necessary attachments to the comments. If comments are submitted in hard copy form, please ensure that two copies are provided. If you wish to receive confirmation that your comments were received, please enclose a stamped, selfaddressed postcard with the comments. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to *http:// www.regulations.gov*, including any personal information provided.

Documents submitted to a docket may be viewed by anyone at the address and times given above. The documents may also be viewed on the Internet at *http:// www.regulations.gov* by following the online instructions for accessing the dockets. DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement is available for review in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000, (65 FR 19477–78).

The petition, supporting materials, and all comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated below will be filed and will be considered. All comments and supporting materials received after the closing date will also be filed and will be considered to the extent possible. When the petition is granted or denied, notice of the decision will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

DATES: *Comment Closing Date:* September 10, 2012.

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

Issued on: July 30, 2012.

Claude H. Harris,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance. [FR Doc. 2012–19575 Filed 8–8–12; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2012-0019; Notice 2]

Utilimaster Corporation, Denial of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT. **ACTION:** Notice of Petition Denial.

SUMMARY: Utilimaster Corporation (Utilimaster),¹ has determined that certain model year 2009–2011 Utilimaster walk-in van-type trucks manufactured between September 1, 2009 and December 22, 2011 do not comply with paragraph S4.2.1 of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 206, *Door Locks and Door Retention Components.* Utilimaster filed an appropriate report dated December 30, 2011, pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports.*

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) and the rule implementing those provisions at 49 CFR part 556, on January 23, 2012, Spartan Motors, Inc.,² on behalf of Utilimaster, 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. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) published a notice of receipt of the petition, with a 30-day public comment period, on February 17, 2012, in the Federal Register (77 FR 9726). The only comments received were from Morgan Olson, LLC (Morgan Olson).³ To view the petition, the comments, and all supporting documents log onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Web site at: http:// www.regulations.gov/. Then follow the online search instructions to locate docket number "NHTSA-2012-0019."

Contact Information: For further information on this decision contact Mr. Tony Lazzaro, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), telephone (202) 366–5304, facsimile (202) 366–7002.

Relevant Requirements of FMVSS No. 206: FMVSS No. 206 paragraph S4.2.1 requires in pertinent part that each sliding door system shall be equipped with either: (a) At least one primary door latch system, or (b) a door latch system with a fully latched position and a door closure warning system. The door closure warning system shall be located where it can be clearly seen by the driver.

A "primary door latch" is defined in FMVSS No. 206 paragraph S3 as "a latch equipped with both a fully latched position and a secondary latch position and is designated as a 'primary door latch' by the manufacturer." A "secondary latched position" refers to "the coupling condition of the latch that retains the door in a partially closed position." FMVSS No. 206 paragraph S3.

A "door closure warning system" is defined in FMVSS No. 206 paragraph S3 as "a system that will activate a visual signal when a door latch system is not in its fully latched position and the vehicle ignition system is activated."

¹ Utilimaster Corporation, a wholly owned subsidiary of Spartan Motors, Inc., is a manufacturer of motor vehicles.

² Spartan Motors, Inc., is a manufacturer of motor vehicles.

³ Morgan Olson, LLC, is a manufacturer of motor vehicles.