in front of each replaceable light source with which it is equipped that states either: The HB Type, if the light source conforms to S11 of this standard for filament light sources, . . . .

V. Summary of GM’s Analyses

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

(A) The high-beam headlamp lenses in question are clearly marked “9005” (the ANSI designation), which GM believes to be a well-known alternative designation recognized throughout the automotive industry and used by lighting manufacturers interchangeably with HB3, the lamp’s HB type. GM also verified that the vehicle owner’s manuals identify the high beam replacement bulb as 9005.

(B) That the mismarked high-beam headlamps are the correct headlamps for the subject vehicles and that they conform to all other requirements including photometric as required by FMVSS No. 108.

(C) The risk of customer confusion when selecting a correct replacement bulb is remote. Both the HB3 type and the 9005 ANSI designation are marked on the vehicles’ headlamp bulb sockets, and packaging for replacement bulbs is commonly marked with both the HB type and the ANSI designation. GM searched a number of national automotive parts stores (Autozone, O’Reilly, Advanced Auto Parts, and Pep Boys), and found that all HB3 replacement bulbs in these stores were marked with the 9005 ANSI designation. Should a consumer attempt to install an incorrect bulb into the headlamp sockets, the bulb could not be successfully installed because of the unique nature of the socket hardware.

(D) GM also cited several previous petitions that NHTSA has granted dealing with noncompliance issues that GM believes are similar to the noncompliance that is the subject of its petition. Based on these decisions, GM believes that there is also precedent to support granting its petition.

GM is not aware of any VOQ or field data in which a consumer has complained of not being able to identify the proper replacement headlamp bulb for the affected vehicles, which GM believes to be evidence that this noncompliance is not impacting consumers.

GM has additionally informed NHTSA that it has corrected the noncompliance by adding the HB3 designation bulb type to the high-beam headlamp lens in all vehicles produced on or after February 21, 2015.

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

NHTSA’s “Analysis: We agree with GM that the ANSI “9005” designation is a well-known alternative designation for the HB3 light source and that replacement light source packaging is commonly marked with both the HB type and ANSI designation. As such, we believe that consumers can properly identify and purchase the correct replacement upper beam light source for the affected vehicles. Further, the unique bulb holder design incorporated into the headlamps would prevent consumers from installing a light source other than an HB3/9005 so there would be no effect on headlamp performance.

NHTSA’s “Decision: In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA finds that GM has met its burden of persuasion that the subject FMVSS No. 108 noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, GM’s petition is hereby granted and GM 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 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 subject 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.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Office of the Secretary
Contracting Initiative

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary (OST), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The DOT is extending the contracting initiative pilot program for a period of 5 years.

DATES: This pilot program became effective on March 6, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For technical information: Mr. Michael Harkins, Deputy Assistant General Counsel for General Law, Office, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590, 202–366–0590 (telephone), Michael.Harkins@dot.gov (email).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Access


Background

On March 6, 2015, DOT published a notice in the Federal Register (80 FR 12257) establishing a contracting initiative pilot program under which, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) recipients and subrecipients could utilize various contracting requirements that generally have been disallowed due to concerns about adverse impacts on competition. The purpose of the pilot program is to determine whether the use of such requirements “unduly limit competition,” as provided in an August 23, 2013, opinion from the Department of Justice’s Office of Legal Counsel (OLC). DOT established the pilot program for a period of 1 year unless extended. On March 17, 2016, DOT extended this pilot program for a period of 1 additional year, until March 6, 2017 (81 FR 14524). To date, DOT has received only limited data from the program. As a result, DOT has decided to extend the pilot program until March
6, 2022, so that it can gather additional data from more projects to better assess the effect of local hire preferences on competition. The extension of this pilot program will provide FHWA and FTA recipients and subrecipients flexibility to continue operating under the pilot program while DOT conducts its evaluation as well as provide DOT with additional projects to consider in evaluating the impacts on competition.

Please note that Section 415 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, Public Law 114–113 (FY 2016 Appropriations Act), extended by Public Law 114–223 and Public Law 114–254, continues the restriction on the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) from using FY 2016 funds to implement, administer or enforce 49 CFR 18.36(c)(2) for construction hiring. Accordingly, FTA recipients and subrecipients do not need to submit applications for participation in the pilot program for contracts awarded or advertised on or before September 30, 2016.

Additionally, we note that Section 192 of the FY 2016 Appropriations Act (also extended by Public Law 114–223 and Public Law 114–254) expressly authorizes DOT assisted contracts under titles 49 and 23 of the United States Code utilizing geographic, economic, or other hiring preferences not otherwise authorized by law if the grant recipient certifies the following:

1. That except with respect to apprentices or trainees, a pool of readily available but unemployed individuals possessing the knowledge, skill, and ability to perform the work that the contract requires resides in the jurisdiction;
2. That the grant recipient will include appropriate provisions in its bid document ensuring that the contractor does not displace any of its existing employees in order to satisfy such hiring preference; and
3. That any increase in the cost of labor, training, or delays resulting from the use of such hiring preference does not delay or displace any transportation project in the applicable Statewide Transportation Improvement Program or Transportation Improvement Program.

Accordingly, recipients and subrecipients should follow the application process described in the March 6, 2015, Federal Register notice (80 FR 12257), except that recipients and subrecipients must also include the required certifications from Section 192 of the FY 2016 Appropriations Act as discussed above.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of Foreign Assets Control

Sanctions Actions Pursuant to Executive Orders (E.O.s) 13722 and 13687.

AGENCY: Office of Foreign Assets Control, Treasury.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Treasury Department’s Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) is publishing the names of two entities identified as blocked pursuant to E.O. 13722, “Blocking Property of the Government of North Korea and the Workers’ Party of Korea, and Prohibiting Certain Transactions With Respect to North Korea,” and of seven individuals whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13687, “Imposing Additional Sanctions With Respect to North Korea.”

DATES: OFAC’s actions described in this notice were effective on January 11, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The Department of the Treasury’s Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) is publishing the names of two entities identified as blocked pursuant to E.O. 13722, “Blocking Property of the Government of North Korea and the Workers’ Party of Korea, and Prohibiting Certain Transactions With Respect to North Korea,” and of seven individuals whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13687, “Imposing Additional Sanctions With Respect to North Korea.”

Electronic and Facsimile Availability

The Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons List and additional information concerning OFAC sanctions programs are available on OFAC’s Web site (www.treasury.gov/ofac).

Notice of OFAC Actions

On January 11, 2017, OFAC identified the following two entities as blocked pursuant to E.O. 13722, “Blocking Property of the Government of North Korea and the Workers’ Party of Korea, and Prohibiting Certain Transactions With Respect to North Korea”:

Entities

1. MINISTRY OF LABOR, Korea, North [DPRK3].

2. STATE PLANNING COMMISSION, Korea, North [DPRK3].

In addition, on January 11, 2017, OFAC blocked the property and interests in property of the following seven individuals pursuant to E.O. 13687, “Imposing Additional Sanctions With Respect to North Korea”:

Individuals

1. KIM, Won Hong (a.k.a. KIM, Wo’-n-hong), Korea, North; DOB 17 Jul 1945; Gender Male; Minister of State Security (individual) [DPRK2].

2. KIM, Yo Jong (a.k.a. KIM, Yo’-cho’ng), Korea, North; DOB 26 Sep 1989; Gender Female; Vice Director of the Workers’ Party of Korea Propaganda and Agitation Department (individual) [DPRK2].

3. KIM, Il-Nam (a.k.a. KIM, Il Nam), Korea, North; DOB 09 Apr 1958; Gender Male; Chief, South Hamgyong Province, Ministry of State Security (individual) [DPRK2].

4. CHOE, Hwi, Korea, North; DOB 01 Jan 1954 to 31 Dec 1955; Gender Male; First Vice Director of the Workers’ Party of Korea Propaganda and Agitation Department (individual) [DPRK2].

5. JO, Yong-Won (a.k.a. CHO, Yongwon), Korea, North; DOB 24 Oct 1957; Gender Male; Vice Director of the Organization and Guidance Department (individual) [DPRK2].

6. MIN, Byong Chol (a.k.a. MIN, Byong Chun; a.k.a. MIN, Byong-chol; a.k.a. MIN, Pyo’ng-ch’ol), Korea, North; DOB 10 Aug 1948; Gender Male; Member of the Worker’s Party of Korea’s Organization and Guidance Department (individual) [DPRK2].

7. KANG, P’Il-Hun (a.k.a. KANG, Phil Hun); a.k.a. KANG, Pil Hoon), Korea, North; DOB 11 Jun 1943; Gender Male; Director of the General Political Bureau of the Ministry of People’s Security (individual) [DPRK2].


John E. Smith,
Acting Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control.

Notice.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of Foreign Assets Control

Unblocking of Specially Designated National and Blocked Person Pursuant to Executive Order 13469

AGENCY: Office of Foreign Assets Control, Treasury.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of the Treasury’s Office of Foreign Assets