

chime, will mitigate any potential confusion by the driver that the ISO/ECE symbol telltale is related to issues with the brake system.

4. Ford reports that it is not aware of any reports of crashes, injuries, or deaths that might be related to this particular noncompliance nor for this condition as a whole. While Ford recognizes that a lack of reports of injury does not guarantee future safety in all cases, Ford believes that this clearly illustrates that drivers are not confused by the use of the ISO/ECE brake telltale instead of the FMVSS compliant telltale.

5. Ford lists a number of petitions for inconsequential noncompliance granted by NHTSA that it believes are substantively similar to this petition:

a. A 2017 petition submitted by Porsche Cars North America, Inc., for Porsche 911 vehicles that used the ISO/ECE symbol instead of the required “BRAKE” text was granted by NHTSA after Porsche noted that the vehicles had described the symbol in the owner’s manual, there was a chime and message on the display, and there were no known complaints of injuries related to this condition. (82 FR 4976, October 25, 2017).

b. A 2014 petition submitted by Chrysler Group, LLC, for Jeep and Dodge vehicles using the ISO/ECE symbol instead of the “BRAKE” text was granted by NHTSA after Chrysler argued that the symbol is listed in the owner’s manual, the presence of redundant warning systems, and the lack of reported incidents. (79 FR 78559, December 30, 2014.)

c. A petition submitted by General Motors in 2012 for Chevrolet and Buick vehicles that used the ISO/ECE symbol for the parking brake instead of the “BRAKE” text was granted by NHTSA after GM pointed out that the vehicles had redundant warning systems, automatic release of the parking brake, and the lack of reported incidents relating to the condition. (79 FR 9041, February 14, 2014.)

d. Another petition was submitted by General Motors in 2016 for Cadillac vehicles that used the FMVSS mandated “PARK” telltale, but the height of the lettering was insufficient. The petition was granted by NHTSA on the grounds that these vehicles had redundant warning systems, automatic release of the parking brake, and the lack of reported incidents relating to the condition. (81 FR 92963, December 20, 2016.)

Ford argues that the NHTSA should grant this petition for inconsequential noncompliance because it has already

set a precedent by granting the above listed similar petitions.

Ford finishes by reiterating and summarizing the arguments listed above. Ford believes that NHTSA should grant its petition because the existing telltales in these vehicles otherwise conform to FMVSS requirements, the meaning of the nonconforming symbol is clearly described in the owner’s manual, there are redundant notification systems that will alert the driver of issues with the braking system, there are no known reports of crashes or injuries related to this issue, and finally that NHTSA has granted similar petitions in the past.

Ford concludes by stating its belief that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety and 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.

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 vehicles that Ford no longer controlled at the time it determined that the noncompliance existed. However, any decision on 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 Ford 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. 2025–14475 Filed 7–30–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

[Docket No. PHMSA–2025–0012]

Pipeline Safety: Information Collection Activities

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

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces that the two information collection requests abstracted below are being forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. A **Federal Register** notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on the information collections was published on May 7, 2025.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before September 2, 2025.

ADDRESSES: The public is invited to submit comments regarding these information collection requests, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Attention: Desk Officer for the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, 725 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20503. Comments can also be submitted electronically at www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Angela Hill by email at angela.hill@dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) section 1320.8(d), requires the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) to provide interested members of the public and affected agencies the opportunity to comment on information collection and recordkeeping requests before they are submitted to OMB for approval. In accordance with this regulation, on May 7, 2025, PHMSA published a **Federal Register** notice (90 FR 19369) with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on its intent to request OMB’s renewed approval of the two information collection requests that are due to expire on November 30, 2025.

During the 60-day comment period, PHMSA received no comments pertaining to the proposed renewal of the impacted information collections.

II. Summary of Impacted Collections

PHMSA will request a three-year term of approval for each of the following information collection activities. The following information is provided for each information collection: (1) Title of the information collection; (2) OMB control number; (3) Current expiration date; (4) Type of request; (5) Abstract of the information collection activity; (6) Description of affected public; (7) Estimate of total annual reporting and recordkeeping burden; and (8) Frequency of collection.

PHMSA requests comments on the following:

1. *Title*: “Rupture Mitigation Valve Recordkeeping Requirements”.

OMB Control Number: 2137–0637.

Current Expiration Date: 11/30/2025.

Abstract: Operators who have experienced a rupture or rupture-mitigation valve shut-off are required to complete a post-incident review. The post-incident summary, all investigation and analysis documents used to prepare it, and records of lessons learned must be kept for the life of the pipeline.

Operators must also develop written rupture identification procedures to evaluate and identify whether a notification of potential rupture is an actual rupture event or non-rupture event as soon as practicable. These procedures must, at a minimum, specify the sources of information, operational factors, and other criteria that operator personnel use to evaluate a notification of potential rupture. Operators are also required to maintain certain records if they experience certain circumstances involving their rupture-mitigation valve operations.

Affected Public: Operators of PHMSA-regulated pipelines.

Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden:

Total Annual Responses: 4,213.

Total Annual Burden Hours: 85,724.

Frequency of Collection: On occasion.

2. *Title*: “Rupture Mitigation Valve Notification Requirements”.

OMB Control Number: 2137–0638.

Current Expiration Date: 11/30/2025.

Abstract: 49 CFR 192.634 and 49 CFR 195.418 require operators who elect to use alternative equivalent technology to notify PHMSA’s Office of Pipeline Safety at least 90 days in advance of use. An operator choosing this option must include a technical and safety evaluation, including design, construction, and operating procedures for the alternative equivalent technology with the notification.

Operators must notify PHMSA if a rupture-mitigation valve cannot be made operational within 14 days of

installation. Operators must also notify PHMSA if a valve cannot be repaired or replaced within 12 months.

An operator may seek exemption from certain regulatory requirements by notifying PHMSA in certain instances. An operator may plan to leave a rupture-mitigation valve open for more than 30 minutes following a rupture identification if the operator demonstrates to PHMSA, that closing a rupture mitigation valve, or alternative equivalent technology, would be detrimental to public safety. Likewise, for hazardous liquid pipeline segments in a non-high consequence area (HCA) or a non-HCA could-affect segment, an operator may request exemption from certain requirements if it can demonstrate to PHMSA that installing an otherwise-required rupture-mitigation valve, or alternative equivalent technology, would be economically, technically, or operationally infeasible.

Affected Public: Operators of PHMSA-regulated pipelines.

Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden:

Total Annual Responses: 598.

Total Annual Burden Hours: 2,378.

Frequency of Collection: On occasion.

Comments are invited on:

(a) The need for this information collections 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) 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 those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques.

Authority: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995; 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended, and 49 CFR 1.48.

Issued in Washington, DC, on July 29, 2025, under authority delegated in 49 CFR 1.97.

John A. Gale,

Director, Standards and Rulemaking Division.

[FR Doc. 2025–14505 Filed 7–30–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–60–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Bureau of the Fiscal Service

Prompt Payment Interest Rate; Contract Disputes Act

AGENCY: Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Treasury.

ACTION: Notice of prompt payment interest rate; Contract Disputes Act.

SUMMARY: For the period beginning July 1, 2025, and ending on December 31, 2025, the prompt payment interest rate is 4⁵/₈ per centum per annum.

DATES: Applicable July 1, 2025, to December 31, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Comments or inquiries may be mailed to: Alternative Payments Division, Bureau of the Fiscal Service, 801 9th Street NW, Washington, DC 20220. Comments or inquiries may also be emailed to PromptPayment@fiscal.treasury.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Thomas M. Burnum, Alternative Payments Division, (202) 874–6430; or Ashlee Adams, Senior Counsel, Office of the Chief Counsel, (304) 480–8692.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: An agency that has acquired property or service from a business concern and has failed to pay for the complete delivery of property or service by the required payment date shall pay the business concern an interest penalty. 31 U.S.C. 3902(a). The Contract Disputes Act of 1978, sec. 12, Public Law 95–563, 92 Stat. 2389, and the Prompt Payment Act, 31 U.S.C. 3902(a), provide for the calculation of interest due on claims at the rate established by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Secretary of the Treasury has the authority to specify the rate by which the interest shall be computed for interest payments under section 12 of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 and under the Prompt Payment Act. Under the Prompt Payment Act, if an interest penalty is owed to a business concern, the penalty shall be paid regardless of whether the business concern requested payment of such penalty. 31 U.S.C. 3902(c)(1). Agencies must pay the interest penalty calculated with the interest rate, which is in effect at the time the agency accrues the obligation to pay a late payment interest penalty. 31 U.S.C. 3902(a). “The interest penalty shall be paid for the period beginning on the day after the required payment date and ending on the date on which payment is made.” 31 U.S.C. 3902(b).

Therefore, notice is given that the Secretary of the Treasury has determined that the rate of interest