

In each of the samples, HFT states that the deviation is well within 25% of the required values. The plot diagram at Attachment 7⁴ provides a visual depiction of the relationship between the two outlier values to the 520 cd minimum for the Zone 3 test results for the submersible trailer light kits tested by Calcoast. The plot diagram at Attachment 8 gives a visual depiction of the relationship between the outlier values and the photometric requirements for the magnetic trailer light kits.

4. HFT states that an alternative basis on which to grant the petition is the performance exceedances of each of the other surrounding zones. Zones 1, 2, 4 and 5 all exceeded the minimum candela value for their respective zone by wide margins (e.g. from a range of 27%–44% higher than the minimum candela value for the zone for one sample and 26%–37% higher than the minimum candela value for each zone for the other sample). Thus, HFT claims the minor discrepancy in one zone is offset by the substantial (and compliant) exceedances in the remaining zones. Taking the performance of the lamp as a whole, and because drivers view the output of lamps as a whole rather than at individual points within the lamp, the additional light from the other zones would compensate for the deviation in Zone 3. HFT states that this rationale is consistent with the agency's findings in other similar petitions which concluded that enhanced photometric values in other areas of the same lamp could effectively minimize a minor deviation in one portion of the lamp.⁵

5. Separately, HFT also states that NHTSA has recognized the inherent challenges to manufacture all lamps so that each and every test point within the lamp meets the minimum criteria. HFT claims that is the case here. When HFT commissioned Calcoast to review and confirm the performance of these lighting products, it tested a total of 24 sets of lamps produced over a seven month/year period. Of that universe, there were just two samples of submersible trailer light kits that had slightly reduced photometric values and three samples of the magnetic trailer light kit that experienced minimal exceedances. HFT claims that this

indicates that the LED lamps were in fact designed to comply with FMVSS No. 108 and that the results of the monitoring testing indicate an isolated number of random failures, not a systemic lapse in production processes. NHTSA has stated that it will not consider a lamp to be noncompliant if its failure to meet a test point is random and occasional.⁶ Thus, historically, there has never been an absolute requirement that every motor vehicle lighting device meet every single photometric test point to comply with FMVSS No. 108.

6. Finally, HFT has reviewed its systems and has not received any reports or complaints about the levels of brightness for these trailer lighting kits. The lack of reports or indications that the subject trailer lights are either too bright or too dim supports the conclusion that the condition is undetectable to road users such as drivers following a vehicle equipped with either of the lighting products. HFT is providing copies of the relevant Calcoast test reports with this petition at Attachment 2 for the submersible trailer light kits and at Attachments 3 and 4 for the magnetic trailer light kits.

HFT concludes that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety and that its petition to be exempted from providing notification of the noncompliance, as required by 49 U.S.C. 30118, and a remedy for the noncompliance, as required by 49 U.S.C. 30120, should be granted.

HFT's complete petition and all supporting documents are available by logging onto the FDMS website at <https://www.regulations.gov> and by following the online search instructions to locate the docket number as listed in the title of this notice.

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, any decision on this petition only applies to the subject equipment that HFT no longer controlled at the time it determined that the noncompliance existed. However, any decision on this petition does not relieve equipment distributors and dealers of the

prohibitions on the sale, offer for sale, or introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of the noncompliant equipment under their control after HFT 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.

Otto G. Matheke III,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2021–18355 Filed 8–25–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Petition for Exemption From the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; American Honda Motor Co., Inc.

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

ACTION: Grant of petition for exemption.

SUMMARY: This document grants in full the American Honda Motor Co., Inc.'s (Honda) petition for exemption from the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard (theft prevention standard) for its Acura RDX vehicle line beginning in model year (MY) 2022. The petition is granted because the agency has determined that the anti-theft device to be placed on the line as standard equipment 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.

DATES: The exemption granted by this notice is effective beginning with the 2022 model year.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carlita Ballard, Office of International Policy, Fuel Economy, and Consumer Programs, NHTSA, West Building, W43–439, NRM–310, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. Ms. Ballard's phone number is (202) 366–5222. Her fax number is (202) 493–2990.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under 49 U.S.C. chapter 331, the Secretary of Transportation (and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) by delegation) is required to promulgate a theft prevention standard to provide for the identification of certain motor vehicles and their major replacement parts to impede motor vehicle theft. NHTSA promulgated regulations at 49 CFR part 541 (theft prevention standard) to require parts-

⁴ HFT's petition and the attachments can be found in full at <https://www.regulations.gov> by following the online instructions for accessing the docket. The docket ID number for this petition is shown in the heading of this notice.

⁵ See *General Motors Corporation; Grant of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance*; 61 FR 1663, January 22, 1996; see also *BMW of North America, LLC, Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance*; 82 FR 55484, November 21, 2017.

⁶ See *Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment*; 83 FR 51766, October 12, 2018.

marking for specified passenger motor vehicles and light trucks. Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 33106, manufacturers that are subject to the parts-marking requirements may petition the Secretary of Transportation for an exemption for a line of passenger motor vehicles equipped with an antitheft device as standard equipment that the Secretary decides is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements. In accordance with this statute, NHTSA promulgated 49 CFR part 543, which establishes the process through which manufacturers may seek an exemption from the theft prevention standard.

49 CFR 543.5 provides general submission requirements for petitions and states that each manufacturer may petition NHTSA for an exemption of one vehicle line per model year. Among other requirements, manufacturers must identify whether the exemption is sought under section 543.6 or section 543.7. Under section 543.6, a manufacturer may request an exemption by providing specific information about the antitheft device, its capabilities, and the reasons the petitioner believes the device to be as effective at reducing and deterring theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements. Section 543.7 permits a manufacturer to request an exemption under a more streamlined process if the vehicle line is equipped with an antitheft device (an “immobilizer”) as standard equipment that complies with one of the standards specified in that section.¹

Section 543.8 establishes requirements for processing petitions for exemption from the theft prevention standard. As stated in section 543.8(a), NHTSA processes any complete exemption petition. If NHTSA receives an incomplete petition, NHTSA will notify the petitioner of the deficiencies. Once NHTSA receives a complete

petition the agency will process it and, in accordance with section 543.8(b), will grant the petition 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.

Section 543.8(c) requires NHTSA to issue its decision either to grant or to deny an exemption petition not later than 120 days after the date on which a complete petition is filed. If NHTSA does not make a decision within the 120-day period, the petition shall be deemed to be approved and the manufacturer shall be exempt from the standard for the line covered by the petition for the subsequent model year.² Exemptions granted under part 543 apply only to the vehicle line or lines that are subject to the grant and that are equipped with the antitheft device on which the line’s exemption was based, and are effective for the model year beginning after the model year in which NHTSA issues the notice of exemption, unless the notice of exemption specifies a later year.

Sections 543.8(f) and (g) apply to the manner in which NHTSA’s decisions on petitions are to be made known. Under section 543.8(f), if the petition is sought under section 543.6, NHTSA publishes a notice of its decision to grant or deny the exemption petition in the **Federal Register** and notifies the petitioner in writing. Under section 543.8(g), if the petition is sought under section 543.7, NHTSA notifies the petitioner in writing of the agency’s decision to grant or deny the exemption petition.

This grant of petition for exemption considers American Honda Motor Co., Inc.’s (Honda) petition for its Acura RDX vehicle line beginning in MY 2022.

I. Specific Petition Content Requirements Under 49 CFR 543.6

Pursuant to 49 CFR part 543, *Exemption from Vehicle Theft Prevention*, Honda petitioned for an exemption for its specified vehicle line from the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standard, beginning in MY 2022. Honda petitioned under 49 CFR 543.6, *Petition: Specific content requirements*, which, as described above, requires manufacturers to provide specific information about the antitheft device installed as standard equipment on all vehicles in the line for which an exemption is sought, the antitheft device’s capabilities, and the reasons the petitioner believes the device to be as effective at reducing and

deterring theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements.

More specifically, section 543.6(a)(1) requires petitions to include a statement that an antitheft device will be installed as standard equipment on all vehicles in the line for which the exemption is sought. Under section 543.6(a)(2), each petition must list each component in the antitheft system, and include a diagram showing the location of each of those components within the vehicle. As required by section 543.6(a)(3), each petition must include an explanation of the means and process by which the device is activated and functions, including any aspect of the device designed to: (1) Facilitate or encourage its activation by motorists; (2) attract attention to the efforts of an unauthorized person to enter or move a vehicle by means other than a key; (3) prevent defeating or circumventing the device by an unauthorized person attempting to enter a vehicle by means other than a key; (4) prevent the operation of a vehicle which an unauthorized person has entered using means other than a key; and (5) ensure the reliability and durability of the device.³

In addition to providing information about the antitheft device and its functionality, petitioners must also submit the reasons for their belief that the antitheft device will be effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft, including any theft data and other data that are available to the petitioner and form a basis for that belief,⁴ and the reasons for their belief that the agency should determine that the antitheft device is likely to be as effective as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of part 541 in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft. In support of this belief, the petitioners should include any statistical data that are available to the petitioner and form the basis for the petitioner’s belief that a line of passenger motor vehicles equipped with the antitheft device is likely to have a theft rate equal to or less than that of passenger motor vehicles of the same, or a similar line which have parts marked in compliance with part 541.⁵

The following sections describe Honda’s petition information provided pursuant to 49 CFR part 543, *Exemption from Vehicle Theft Prevention*. To the extent that specific information in Honda’s petition is subject to a properly filed confidentiality request, that

¹ 49 CFR 543.7 specifies that the manufacturer must include a statement that their entire vehicle line is equipped with an immobilizer that meets one of the following standards:

(1) The performance criteria (subsections 8 through 21) of C.R.C. c. 1038.114, Theft Protection and Rollaway Prevention (in effect March 30, 2011), as excerpted in appendix A of [part 543];

(2) National Standard of Canada CAN/ULC-S338-98, Automobile Theft Deterrent Equipment and Systems: Electronic Immobilization (May 1998);

(3) United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE) Regulation No. 97 (ECE R97), Uniform Provisions Concerning Approval of Vehicle Alarm System (VAS) and Motor Vehicles with Regard to Their Alarm System (AS) in effect August 8, 2007; or

(4) UN/ECE Regulation No. 116 (ECE R116), Uniform Technical Prescriptions Concerning the Protection of Motor Vehicles Against Unauthorized Use in effect on February 10, 2009.

² 49 U.S.C. 33106(d).

³ 49 CFR 543.6(a)(3).

⁴ 49 CFR 543.6(a)(4).

⁵ 49 CFR 543.6(a)(5).

information was not disclosed as part of this notice.⁶

II. Honda's Petition for Exemption

In a petition dated January 12, 2021, as supplemented with additional information submitted on June 22, 2021,⁷ Honda requested an exemption from the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standard for the Acura RDX vehicle line beginning with MY 2022.

In its petition, Honda provided a detailed description and diagram of the identity, design, and location of the components of the antitheft device for the Acura RDX vehicle line. Honda stated that its MY 2022 Acura RDX vehicle line will be installed with an engine immobilizer device as standard equipment, as required by 543.6(a)(1). Honda stated that it will offer a "smart entry remote" (keyless key) system on its vehicle line. Honda also stated that the Acura RDX vehicle line will offer two types of remotes, one with remote engine start and one without remote start. Key components of the "smart entry remote" system will include a passive immobilizer, "smart entry" remote, powertrain control module (PCM), and body control module (BCM). Honda further stated that its vehicle line will be installed with a vehicle security alarm system as standard equipment which will activate a visible and audible alarm whenever unauthorized access is attempted.

Pursuant to Section 543.6(a)(3), Honda explained that its "smart entry and start" system is part of the normal operation of the ignition key and activates automatically when the ignition switch is in the "OFF" position. Honda further explained that if a smart entry remote without a matching code is within operating range and the engine start/stop button is pressed, the PCM will prevent fueling of the engine and the engine will not start. Honda also stated that the immobilizer system is deactivated when a valid smart entry remote and matching codes are verified, allowing the engine to continue normal operations. Honda further stated that the security indicator flashes continuously when the immobilizer is activated, and turns off when it is deactivated.

Honda stated that the audible and visible vehicle security alarm system installed on its Acura RDX vehicles will monitor any attempts of unauthorized entry and attract attention to an unauthorized person attempting to enter

its vehicles without the use of a "smart entry" remote or its built-in mechanical door key. Specifically, Honda stated that whenever an attempt is made to open one of its vehicle doors, hood or trunk without using the "smart entry" remote or turning a key in the key cylinder to disarm the vehicle, the vehicle's horn will sound and its lights will flash. Honda stated that its vehicle security system is activated when all of the doors are locked and the hood and trunk are closed and locked. Honda further stated that its vehicle security system is deactivated by using the key fob buttons to unlock the vehicle doors or having the "smart entry" remote within operating range when the operator grabs either of the vehicle's front door handles.

Honda also stated that in addition to the standard security system on all 2022 MY Acura RDX models, additional security features include counterfeit resistant vehicle identification number (VIN) plates, secondary VINs, a hood release located inside the vehicle, and its smart entry remote will utilize rolling codes for the lock and unlock functions of its vehicles.

As required in section 543.6(a)(3)(v), Honda provided information on the reliability and durability of its proposed device. To ensure reliability and durability of the device, Honda provided a list of requirements for the characteristics and durability testing along with its results. Honda stated that its device does not require the presence of a "smart entry" remote battery to function nor does it have any moving parts (*i.e.*, the PCM, BCM, "smart entry" remote and the corresponding electrical components found within its own housing units), which it believes reduces the chance for deterioration and wear from normal use.

Honda believes that installation of the antitheft immobilizer device as standard equipment reduces the vehicle theft rate by making conventional methods of theft obsolete, *i.e.*, punching out the steering column or hot-wiring the ignition. Additionally, Honda stated that the proposed immobilizer system was first installed on its MY 2007 Acura RDX as standard equipment which was the first year of its introduction. Honda referenced NHTSA's theft rate information for the Acura RDX showing theft rates for MYs 2007–2014 were below the theft rate median. Also, Honda stated that its proposed immobilizer system is similar to the design offered on its Lexus RX vehicles which have been granted an exemption by the agency. Honda also referenced NHTSA's theft rate information for its Lexus RX showing theft rates for MYs

2012–2014 that were below the theft rate median.

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 Honda 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 Honda provided about its antitheft device. NHTSA believes, based on Honda's supporting evidence, 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 Honda's antitheft device will provide the five types of performance features listed in section 543.6(a)(3): Promoting activation; attracting attention to the efforts of unauthorized persons to enter or operate a vehicle by means other than a key; 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 Honda 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

⁶ 49 CFR 512.20(a).

⁷ As discussed above, per 49 CFR 543.8(a), NHTSA processes the petition once the manufacturer submits all the information required by 49 CFR part 543.

(marking of major component parts and replacement parts).

NHTSA notes that if Honda 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 Honda 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 Honda's petition for exemption for the Acura RDX 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. 2021-18419 Filed 8-25-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

[Docket No. PHMSA-2021-0052]

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration Pipeline Safety: Request for Special Permit; Sabal Trail Transmission, LLC

AGENCY: Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA); DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: PHMSA is publishing this notice to solicit public comments on a request for special permit received from the Sabal Trail Transmission, LLC (STT). The special permit request is seeking relief from compliance with certain requirements in the federal

pipeline safety regulations. At the conclusion of the 30-day comment period, PHMSA will review the comments received from this notice as part of its evaluation to grant or deny the special permit request.

DATES: Submit any comments regarding this special permit request by September 27, 2021.

ADDRESSES: Comments should reference the docket number for this special permit request and may be submitted in the following ways:

- *E-Gov Website:* <http://www.Regulations.gov>. This site allows the public to enter comments on any Federal Register notice issued by any agency.
- *Fax:* 1-202-493-2251.
- *Mail:* Docket Management System: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.
- *Hand Delivery:* Docket Management System: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590, between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Instructions: You should identify the docket number for the special permit request you are commenting on at the beginning of your comments. If you submit your comments by mail, please submit two (2) copies. To receive confirmation that PHMSA has received your comments, please include a self-addressed stamped postcard. Internet users may submit comments at <http://www.Regulations.gov>.

Note: There is a privacy statement published on <http://www.Regulations.gov>. Comments, including any personal information provided, are posted without changes or edits to <http://www.Regulations.gov>.

Confidential Business Information: Confidential Business Information (CBI) is commercial or financial information that is both customarily and actually treated as private by its owner. Under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) (5 U.S.C. 552), CBI is exempt from public disclosure. If your comments responsive to this notice contain commercial or financial information that is customarily treated as private, that you actually treat as private, and that is relevant or responsive to this notice, it is important that you clearly designate the submitted comments as CBI. Pursuant to 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 190.343, you may ask PHMSA to give confidential

treatment to information you give to the agency by taking the following steps: (1) Mark each page of the original document submission containing CBI as "Confidential"; (2) send PHMSA, along with the original document, a second copy of the original document with the CBI deleted; and (3) explain why the information you are submitting is CBI. Unless you are notified otherwise, PHMSA will treat such marked submissions as confidential under the FOIA, and they will not be placed in the public docket of this notice. Submissions containing CBI should be sent to Kay McIver, DOT, PHMSA-PHP-80, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590-0001. Any commentary PHMSA receives that is not specifically designated as CBI will be placed in the public docket for this matter.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

General: Ms. Kay McIver by telephone at 202-366-0113, or by email at kay.mciver@dot.gov.

Technical: Mr. Steve Nanney by telephone at 713-272-2855, or by email at steve.nanney@dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: PHMSA received a special permit request from STT, a joint venture between Spectra Energy Partners, LP (Enbridge), NextEra Energy, Inc., and Duke Energy, which is operated by Enbridge Inc., seeking a waiver from the requirements of 49 CFR 192.611: Change in class location: Confirmation or revision of maximum allowable operating pressure. This special permit is being requested in lieu of pipe replacement or pressure reduction for one (1) special permit segment totaling 53,486 feet (approximately 10.130 miles) on the STT Line 1 Pipeline. The proposed special permit segment is located in Sumter County, Florida. The STT Line 1 Pipeline class location in the special permit segment has changed from a Class 1 to a Class 3 location. The STT Line 1 Pipeline special permit segment is a 36-inch diameter pipeline with an existing maximum allowable operating pressure of 1,456 pounds per square inch gauge. The installation of the special permit segment occurred in 2017.

The special permit request, proposed special permit with conditions, and Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for the above listed STT pipeline segments are available for review and public comments in Docket No. PHMSA-2021-0052. PHMSA invites interested persons to review and submit comments on the special permit request and DEA in the docket. Please include any comments on potential safety and