

privacy-notice for the privacy notice of *regulations.gov*. To facilitate comment tracking, we encourage commenters to provide their name, or the name of their organization; however, submission of names is completely optional. If you wish to provide comments containing proprietary or confidential information, please contact FRA for alternate submission instructions.

Issued in Washington, DC.

Carolyn R. Hayward-Williams,

Director, Office of Railroad Systems and Technology.

[FR Doc. 2025-03331 Filed 2-28-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

[Docket Number FRA-2013-0077]

Notice of Petition for Extension of Waiver of Compliance

AGENCY: Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This document provides the public notice that by letter dated December 26, 2024, the Association of American Railroads (AAR) petitioned FRA for an extension of relief from certain regulations concerning rail cars equipped with end of car cushioning units.

DATES: FRA must receive comments on the petition by April 2, 2025. FRA will consider comments received after that date to the extent practicable.

ADDRESSES:

Comments related to this docket may be submitted by going to <https://www.regulations.gov> and following the online instructions for submitting comments.

Instructions: All submissions must include the agency name and docket number. All comments received will be posted without change to <https://www.regulations.gov>; this includes any personal information. Please see the Privacy Act heading in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document for Privacy Act information related to any submitted comments or materials.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to <https://www.regulations.gov> and follow the online instructions for accessing the docket.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Leith Al-Nazer, Railroad Safety

Specialist, FRA Motive Power & Equipment Division, telephone: 202-493-6128, email: leith.al-nazer@dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under part 211 of title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this document provides the public notice that by letter dated December 26, 2024, AAR petitioned FRA for an extension of a waiver of compliance from certain provisions of the Federal railroad safety regulations contained at 49 CFR part 215, Railroad Freight Car Safety Standards. The relevant Docket Number is FRA-2013-0077.

Specifically, AAR seeks an extension of relief from § 215.127(c)(1), *Defective draft arrangement*, which specifies that a railroad may not place or continue in service a car if an end of car cushioning unit is leaking clearly formed droplets. AAR proposes to keep a car in service “if the unit is equipped with a [unit condition indicator] that indicates that the cushioning unit is functioning.”

In support of its request, AAR states that the waiver has protected railroad employees “from needless exposure to switching hazards related to jacking freight cars and removing and replacing heavy cushion units because railroads have been able to leave fully functioning cushioning units in place.” Further, AAR notes that the relief has “allowed the industry to avoid unnecessary repairs” due to the current regulatory requirements. The petition also included data from AAR’s performance assessments of units identified as defective by a unit condition indicator.

A copy of the petition, as well as any written communications concerning the petition, is available for review online at www.regulations.gov.

Interested parties are invited to participate in these proceedings by submitting written views, data, or comments. FRA does not anticipate scheduling a public hearing in connection with these proceedings since the facts do not appear to warrant a hearing. If any interested party desires an opportunity for oral comment and a public hearing, they should notify FRA, in writing, before the end of the comment period and specify the basis for their request.

Communications received by April 2, 2025 will be considered by FRA before final action is taken. Comments received after that date will be considered if practicable.

Privacy Act

Anyone can search the electronic form of any written communications and comments received into any of FRA’s dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or

signing the document, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). Under 5 U.S.C. 553(c), DOT solicits comments from the public to inform its processes. DOT posts these comments, without edit, including any personal information the commenter provides, to www.regulations.gov, as described in the system of records notice (DOT/ALL-14 FDMS), which can be reviewed at <https://www.transportation.gov/privacy>. See also <https://www.regulations.gov/privacy-notice> for the privacy notice of *regulations.gov*.

Issued in Washington, DC.

John Karl Alexy,

Associate Administrator for Railroad Safety, Chief Safety Officer.

[FR Doc. 2025-03363 Filed 2-28-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2020-0010; Notice 2]

Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC, Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

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

ACTION: Grant of petition.

SUMMARY: Mercedes-Benz AG (MBAG) and Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC (MBUSA) (collectively, “Mercedes-Benz”) has determined that certain model year (MY) 2019–2020 Mercedes-Benz CLA-Class, A-Class, GLA-Class, and GLB-Class motor vehicles do not fully comply with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 135, *Light Vehicle Brake Systems*. Mercedes-Benz filed a noncompliance report dated January 27, 2020, and subsequently petitioned NHTSA on February 10, 2020, for a decision that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety. This notice announces the grant of Mercedes-Benz’s petition.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Vince Williams, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), telephone (202) 366-2319.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Overview: Mercedes-Benz has determined that certain MY 2019–2020 Mercedes-Benz CLA-Class, A-Class, GLA-Class, and GLB-Class motor vehicles do not fully comply with the requirements of paragraph S5.5.5 of

FMVSS No. 135, *Light Vehicle Brake Systems* (49 CFR 571.135). Mercedes-Benz filed a noncompliance report dated January 27, 2020, pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports*, and subsequently petitioned NHTSA on February 10, 2020, 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 Mercedes-Benz's petition was published with a 30-day public comment period, on May 6, 2020, in the **Federal Register** (85 FR 27024). NHTSA received one comment from the general public. To view the petition and all supporting documents, log onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) website at <https://www.regulations.gov/>. Then follow the online search instructions to locate docket number "NHTSA-2020-0010."

II. Vehicles Involved: Approximately 27,375 of the following MY 2019-2020 Mercedes-Benz CLA-Class, A-Class, GLA-Class, and GLB-Class motor vehicles manufactured between August 20, 2018, and January 16, 2020, are potentially involved:

- Mercedes-Benz A220
- Mercedes-Benz A220 4MATIC
- Mercedes-Benz A35 AMG 4MATIC
- Mercedes-Benz CLA250
- Mercedes-Benz CLA250 4MATIC
- Mercedes-Benz CLA35 AMG 4MATIC
- Mercedes-Benz CLA45 AMG 4MATIC
- Mercedes-Benz GLA250 4MATIC
- Mercedes-Benz GLB250
- Mercedes-Benz GLB250 4MATIC

III. Noncompliance: Mercedes-Benz explains that the noncompliance is that the instrument panel in the subject vehicles displays the braking telltales in a slightly smaller size than required by paragraph S5.5.5 of FMVSS No. 135. Specifically, the size of the text for the brake telltales in the subject vehicles ranges between 2.92 mm to 3.17 mm when the minimum required is 3.2 mm.

IV. Rule Requirements: Paragraph S5.5.5 of FMVSS No. 135, includes the requirements relevant to this petition. Each visual indicator shall display a word or words in accordance with the requirements of FMVSS No. 101 and S5.5 of FMVSS 135, which shall be legible to the driver under all daytime and nighttime conditions when activated. Unless otherwise specified, the words shall have letters not less than 3.2 mm (1/8 inch) high.

V. Summary of Mercedes-Benz's Petition: The following views and arguments presented in this section, "V. Summary of Mercedes-Benz's Petition," are the views and arguments provided by Mercedes-Benz and do not reflect the views of the Agency. In its petition, Mercedes-Benz describes the subject noncompliance and contends that the noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety.

In support of its petition, Mercedes-Benz offers the following reasoning:

1. Mercedes-Benz believes that the letter height of the braking telltales, which in this instance is slightly smaller than the requirement, does not expose an occupant to any greater risk of injury than an occupant in a vehicle with slightly larger font size.

2. Mercedes-Benz alleges that the purpose of the standardized size requirement for the brake system warning telltales is to ensure they are visually perceptible to drivers under all operating conditions. Mercedes-Benz says that the Agency has a long and consistent history of granting petitions for inconsequentiality for discrepancies involving a letter height requirement where the text appeared somewhat smaller than required. Mercedes-Benz says that NHTSA has granted petitions where the telltales displayed included lettering that was as much as a full millimeter less than the minimum size. See 47 FR 31347 (July 19, 1982) (granting a petition of Subaru of America, Inc., where the brake system indicator lettering was only 2.2 mm high, but the ISO symbol telltales were located within the driver's line of sight and continued to be "easily identifiable and very readable").

3. Mercedes-Benz asserts that in addressing similar noncompliances in the past, the Agency has determined that "it is very unlikely that a vehicle user would either fail to see or fail to understand the meaning of the brake . . . warning light" where the "information presented by the telltales is correct." See 81 FR 92963 (December 20, 2016) (granting General Motors' petition of over 46,000 vehicles where the "Park" indicator displayed at 2.44 mm). In the General Motors decision, the Agency found the discrepancy "pose[d] little, if any, risk to motor vehicle safety" where all other braking indicator requirements were met and the telltales were located in the instrument cluster, adjacent to the speedometer and in direct view of the driver); 69 FR 41568 (July 9, 2004) (granting a petition of Hyundai Motor Company involving more than 237,000 vehicles, where the FMVSS No. 105

braking system indicator letter height varied from 2.5 mm to 3.1 mm).

4. In subject noncompliance, the letter height for the braking telltales are only slightly smaller than the 3.2 mm minimum. Depending on the particular indicator, the text size can be smaller by a range of 0.03 mm up to a maximum of .28 mm. The electronic instrument cluster is located within the driver's direct field of vision, and the braking telltales are located adjacent to the speedometer and, therefore, remain within the driver's direct line of sight. Mercedes-Benz claims that this slight difference in size is not visually perceptible and does not affect the driver's ability to read or understand the telltales. Mercedes-Benz further asserts that the telltales are clearly illuminated and remain visible under all driving conditions.

5. Mercedes-Benz states that all the telltales at issue here are accurately depicted and are displayed in the correct colors, consistent with FMVSS No. 101, Table 1. Thus, there should not be any confusion about the meaning of the telltales, and the standard symbol that is displayed continues to convey the intended meaning of the indicator. Further, although the lettering that appears below the ISO symbols is slightly smaller than 3.2 mm minimum height, the overall height of the ABS and Parking Brake symbols is more than 3.2 mm and exceeds the height requirement of the standard. Finally, the functionality of the brake telltales themselves is not affected by the software issue. The telltales properly display during both the instrument cluster warning lamp operation check and in the event a brake malfunction was to occur.

6. Mercedes-Benz says that it has not received any reports related to the performance of the telltales included on the 10.25-inch displays in the subject vehicles. Nor has it received any reports related to customers' inability to read or decipher the brake telltales.

Mercedes-Benz 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.

Mercedes-Benz's complete petition and all supporting documents are available by logging onto the Federal Docket Management System (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.

VI. *Public Comment*: NHTSA received one comment from the general public. While the Agency takes great interest in the public's concerns and appreciates the commenter's feedback, the comment does not address the purpose of this particular petition.

VI. *NHTSA's Analysis*: In determining inconsequentiality of a noncompliance, NHTSA focuses on the safety risk to individuals who experience the type of event against which a recall would otherwise protect.¹ In general, NHTSA does not consider the absence of complaints or injuries when determining if a noncompliance is inconsequential to safety. The absence of complaints does not mean vehicle occupants have not experienced a safety issue, nor does it mean that there will not be safety issues in the future.² Further, because each inconsequential noncompliance petition must be evaluated on its own facts and determinations are highly fact-dependent, NHTSA does not consider prior determinations as binding

¹ 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 than occupant using similar compliant light source).

² See *Morgan 3 Wheeler Limited; Denial of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance*, 81 FR 21663, 21666 (Apr. 12, 2016); see also *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").

precedent. Petitioners are reminded that they have the burden of persuading NHTSA that the noncompliance is inconsequential to safety.

While reviewing the facts of the case, OVSC reached out to Mercedes to find out if there were additional warnings messages that triggered along with the brake indicator. Mercedes provided several screenshots that show supplemental warning messages that activate along with brake indicator and help convey the required brake warnings to the driver. Taking into consideration all of the information provided and the oversized height of the additional information, the Agency agrees with Mercedes-Benz that this noncompliance will not have an adverse effect on vehicle safety. Despite the letter height of the braking telltales being slightly smaller than the 3.2 mm requirement, the overall height of the adjacent ABS and Parking Brake ISO symbols is more than 3.2 mm and exceeds the height requirement of the standard. Additionally, the instrument cluster's braking telltales are adjacent to the speedometer and directly within the driver's direct field of view. The aforementioned facts support a conclusion that it would be unlikely for a driver to fail to perceive and understand the meaning of the illuminated telltale and symbols. As the symbols are accurately depicted and are displayed in the correct colors, consistent with FMVSS No. 101, Table 1, there should not be any confusion about the meaning of the telltales; and the standard symbol that is displayed continues to convey the intended meaning of the indicator. The information presented by the telltales is correct.

VII. *NHTSA's Decision*: In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA finds that Mercedes-Benz has met its burden of persuasion that the subject FMVSS No. 135 noncompliance in the affected vehicles is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, Mercedes-Benz's petition is hereby granted, and Mercedes-Benz is consequently exempted from the obligation of providing notification of, and a free remedy for that noncompliance under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120.

NHTSA notes that the statutory provisions (49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h)) that permit manufacturers to file petitions for a determination of inconsequentiality allow NHTSA to exempt manufacturers only from the duties found in section 30118 and 30120, respectively, to notify owners, purchasers, and dealers of a defect or noncompliance and to remedy the defect or noncompliance. Therefore, this decision only applies to the subject vehicles that Mercedes-Benz no longer controlled at the time it determined that the noncompliance existed. However, the granting of this petition does not relieve vehicle distributors and dealers of the prohibitions on the sale, offer for sale, or introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of the noncompliant vehicles under their control after Mercedes-Benz 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. 2025-03387 Filed 2-28-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P