

are separated by double layers of the FMVSS No. 302 compliant self-extinguishing outer layer material.

b. Only the inner layer, by itself, does not meet the FMVSS No. 302 burn rate, and at 110 mm/minute, it is only marginally above the 102 mm/minute requirement.

c. The sunshade has a storage bag which is made of FMVSS No. 302 compliant material. When the sunshade is stored in the provided bag while the vehicle is in use, the external surface that is presented to the occupant compartment is well within the FMVSS requirement, and two layers of FMVSS No. 302 compliant material would have to be penetrated to reach the marginally noncompliant inner layer.

d. Even if the sunshade was not placed in its storage bag when not in use, the external surface that is presented to the occupant compartment is still FMVSS compliant, and this layer would still need to be penetrated to reach the marginally noncompliant inner layer. In addition, folding it alone reduces the sunshade's surface area to approximately one eighth of the unfolded surface area, further reducing the exposure to any potential ignition source.

e. GM stated its belief that the purpose of FMVSS No. 302 is "to reduce the deaths and injuries to motor vehicle occupants caused by vehicle fires, especially those originating in the interior of the vehicle from sources such as matches or cigarettes." FMVSS No. 302, paragraph S.2. The sunshade is designed to be used only when the vehicle is parked, and it is extremely unlikely that the inner layer would ever come in contact with an ignition source. As such, it is extremely unlikely that a vehicle occupant would ever be exposed to a risk of injury as a result of the noncompliance.

f. Because the sunshade is intended to help reduce sun load during hot weather conditions, it may be removed from the vehicle entirely during colder months, further reducing the exposure of the sunshade to the interior of the vehicle.

g. GM stated its belief that NHTSA has previously granted several inconsequential noncompliance petitions that GM believes can be applied to a decision on its petition. See GM's petition for a complete discussion of its reasoning.

h. There are no known field events involving ignition of sunshades. GM is not aware of any crashes, injuries or customer complaints involving this windshield sunshade.

GM has additionally informed NHTSA that it has corrected the

noncompliance so that all future production vehicles delivered with windshield sunshades will comply with FMVSS No. 302

In summation, GM believes that the described noncompliance of the subject 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.

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 GM no longer controlled at the time it determined that the noncompliance existed. However, any decision on this petition does not relieve motor 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 motor vehicles under their control after GM notified them that the subject noncompliance existed.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; Delegations of authority at 49 CFR parts 1.95 and 501.8.

Claude H. Harris,
Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.
[FR Doc. 2014-00923 Filed 1-17-14; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2013-0040; Notice 2]

General Motors, 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: General Motors, LLC (GM) has determined that certain model year (MY) 2013 Chevrolet Cruze, Chevrolet Volt, and Buick Verano passenger cars manufactured between November 15, 2012 and January 11, 2013, do not fully

comply with paragraph S4.2.6 of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 202a, *Head Restraints; Mandatory Applicability Begins on September 1, 2009*. GM has filed an appropriate report dated February 15, 2013, pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports*.

ADDRESSES: For further information on this decision contact Mr. Ed Chan, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), telephone (202) 493-0335.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. GM's Petition

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) and the rule implementing those provisions at 49 CFR Part 556, GM 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.

Notice of receipt of the petition was published, with a 30-day public comment period, on October 28, 2013 in the **Federal Register** (78 FR 64289). No comments were received. To view the petition 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-2013-0040."

II. Vehicles Involved

Affected are approximately 32,838 MY 2013 Chevrolet Cruze, Chevrolet Volt, and Buick Verano passenger cars manufactured between November 15, 2012 and January 11, 2013.

III. Summary of GM's Analyses

GM explains that the noncompliance is that between 8 and 12 percent of the affected vehicles have rear outboard head restraints that do not meet the height retention requirements specified in paragraph S4.2.6 of FMVSS No. 202a.

GM further explained that the noncompliance is the result of a notch in one of the two head restraint rods not being machined to specifications. This notch corresponds to the rear head restraint's highest adjustment position. This condition does not affect the ability to lock the head restraint in the middle or lowest positions. Nor does it make the head restraint capable of being more easily removed.

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

The root cause of the condition was determined to be a change made by a machine operator which reduced the clamping force in the operation that cuts the notches in the head restraint rod, slightly altering the shape of the notch. Restraints with the altered notch have a lower retention force than design intent.

The retention force for the head restraints with the improperly machined notch was measured as approximately 150 N.

GM recognizes that one of NHTSA's concerns was improper positioning of head restraints due to the head restraint moving out of position either during normal vehicle use or in a crash, as stated in the FMVSS No. 202a NPRM (January 4, 2001, 66 FR 979).

For everyday use, with the adjustment button depressed, these head restraints are designed to move down with a force of 40 ± 20 N. The measured retention force for the improperly machined notch is nearly 4 times the nominal adjustment force and 2.5 times the maximum. Without the button depressed, these head restraints will not "slip" or easily move down from the top adjustment position. For most, it would take a deliberate two-handed action to cause the restraint to move from the top to the mid position without activating the release button. The tactile feedback from such forced movement would be clear indication that it is not the correct method for adjusting the restraint. The opportunity for inadvertent misadjustment of the restraint is also diminished due to the fact that these are rear seat head restraints with no seating positions behind them. They are not at risk for misadjustment as a result of someone bumping or grabbing the restraint for assistance during vehicle ingress and egress.

FMVSS No. 202a provides two compliance options for head restraints. They are Paragraph S4.2 (Dimensional and Static Performance) or paragraph S4.3 (Dynamic Performance and Width). As with most of its vehicles, GM chose to certify the rear seat head restraints for the 2013 Cruze, Verano and Volt, to S4.2 (the "static option") and the front head restraints to S4.3 (the "dynamic option").

In order to evaluate the efficacy of the rear head restraints with the improperly machined notches, GM conducted a series of 6 sled tests at MGA Research. Two tests each were run for the Cruze, Volt and Verano. For each vehicle, one test was run according to the procedure specified by FMVSS No. 202a paragraph S4.3 which places the head restraint in the mid-position, and a second test was run in the same manner as the first test, but with the head restraint placed in the

top position. The top position is that used in the height retention test of the static option, and that position is the one with the improperly machined notch. Improperly machined head restraints and corresponding rod guides were used for each test.

Significantly, in the three sled tests with the head restraint in the uppermost position, the head restraint did not move down. For all tests, the head restraint remained in its pretest height adjustment throughout the test. Also, in all sled tests (upper and mid position) the dummy met the injury criteria specified in the requirements for the dynamic option (<12 degree of neck rotation, <500 HIC) and head restraint width >170 mm.

GM's Arguments

GM believes that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety because for the following reasons occupant protection is not compromised:

1. The noncompliant test vehicles meet the requirements specified under the dynamic compliance option 1 in all six sled tests. Therefore, GM believes that the improperly machined head restraint rod notches do not expose occupants to a significantly greater risk than those with properly machined notches.

2. The head restraints remained in their adjusted positions throughout the tests.

3. The occupant performance criteria specified for the dynamic compliance option was met in both the mid and upper head restraint adjustment positions.

4. These head restraints will maintain their adjusted positions during everyday use of the vehicle.

5. Paragraph S4.2.6 of FMVSS No. 202a allows 13 mm of permanent displacement of the head restraint. By design, the distance between the top and mid adjustment positions of the subject head restraints is 19 mm. Thus, the potential head restraint displacement due to the improperly machined notch is limited to 19 mm.

6. The owner's manual instructions continue to meet all the requirements of FMVSS No. 202a. Even though the head restraint could be forced down to the mid-position, it still requires substantially more effort than it does when the adjustment button at the base of the head restraint is depressed. The owner's manual instructions continue to be the recommended manner of adjustment.

7. GM is not aware of any injuries or customer complaints associated with this condition.

GM has additionally informed NHTSA that it has corrected the noncompliance so that all future production vehicles will comply with FMVSS No. 202a.

In summation, GM believes that the described noncompliance of the subject 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.

IV. NHTSA Decision

NHTSA has reviewed and accepts GM's analyses that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Specifically, the stated noncompliance poses little if any risk to motor vehicle safety because although the vehicles do not meet the static requirements of paragraph S4.2 of FMVSS No. 202a as certified by GM, they do meet the optional dynamic requirements of paragraph S4.3 of FMVSS No. 202a. Consequently, the subject vehicles are no less compliant than vehicles certified to the dynamic option.

Also, while GM's basis of certification for the subject vehicles was the static method, the certification labels on the subject vehicles do not identify the method of certification. Therefore, no associated labeling corrections are necessary.

In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that GM has met its burden of persuasion that the FMVSS No. 202a noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, GM's petition is hereby granted and GM is exempted from the obligation of providing notification of, and a 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 sections 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 vehicles that GM 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 GM 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.

Claude H. Harris,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2014-00922 Filed 1-17-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Advisory Committee on the Readjustment of Veterans; Notice of Meeting

The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) gives notice under Public Law 92-463 (Federal Advisory Committee Act) that a meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Readjustment of Veterans will be held Thursday, February 6 through Friday, February 7, 2014. The meeting will be conducted at the Department of Veterans Affairs Central Office, 810 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20420. The agenda for both days will begin at 8 a.m. and end at 4:30 p.m. The meeting on both days is open to the public.

The purpose of the Committee is to review the post-war readjustment needs of combat Veterans and to evaluate the availability and effectiveness of VA programs to meet these needs.

On February 6, the Committee will be briefed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on current directions and priorities for serving the Nation's war Veterans. The Committee will also hear from the Principle Deputy Under Secretary for Health on new directions of care in Veterans Health Administration (VHA) and the coordination of VA healthcare with readjustment counseling.

Also on this date the Committee will receive briefings from key program officials in VHA and Veterans Benefits Administration (VBA) regarding programs of specific value to the psychological, social and economic readjustment of combat Veterans.

On February 7, the Committee will receive updates on the current activities of the Readjustment Counseling Service Vet Center program to include the full scope of outreach and readjustment counseling services provided to combat Veterans. The briefing will also focus on the coordination of Vet Center services with VHA healthcare and mental health and VBA benefits programs. The Committee will also receive briefings on

new legislative authorities extending Vet Center readjustment services to new eligible Veteran populations. The agenda will conclude with a Committee strategic planning session for developing the annual Committee Report.

No time will be allocated at this meeting for receiving oral presentations from the public. However, members of the public may direct written questions or submit prepared statements for review by the Committee in advance of the meeting to Mr. Charles M. Flora, M.S.W., Designated Federal Officer, Readjustment Counseling Service (15), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20420. Because the meeting will be in a Government building, anyone attending must be prepared to show a valid photo ID for checking in. Please allow 15 minutes before the meeting begins for this process. Those who plan to attend or have questions concerning the meeting may contact Mr. Flora at (202) 461-6525 or charles.flora@va.gov.

Dated: January 14, 2014.

William F. Russo,

Deputy Director, Office of Regulation Policy & Management, Office of the General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2014-00979 Filed 1-17-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320-01-P