and clutch is on and the key FOB is near
the engine start switch, the Key-ID is
scanned via the immobilizer antenna.
The microchip in the key transmits the
Key-ID to the BCM, beginning an
encrypted communication process. If
the Key-ID and encrypted code are
correct, the ECM will allow the engine
to keep running and the driver to
operate the vehicle. If the Key-ID and
encrypted code are not correct, the ECM
will cause the engine to shut down.

Nissan stated the proposed device is
functionally equivalent to the antitheft
device installed on the MY 2011 Nissan
Cube vehicle line, which was granted a
parts-marking exemption by the agency
on April 14, 2010 (75 FR 19458).

Nissan provided data on the
effectiveness of the antitheft device
installed on its Versa vehicle line in
support of the belief its antitheft device
will be highly effective in reducing and
detering theft. Nissan referenced the
National Insurance Crime Bureau’s data,
which it stated showed a 70% reduction in
theft occurring MY 1997 Ford
Mustangs (with a standard immobilizer)
to MY 1995 Ford Mustangs (without an
immobilizer). Nissan also referenced the
Highway Loss Data Institute’s data, which
reported BMW vehicles experienced
theft loss reductions resulting in a 73%
decrease in relative claim frequency and a 78%
lower average loss payment per claim for
vehicles equipped with an immobilizer.

Additionally, Nissan stated theft rates
for its Pathfinder vehicle line
experienced reductions from MY 2000 to
2001 with a two-year period with
implementation of an engine
immobilizer device as standard
equipment. Specifically, Nissan stated the
agency’s theft rate data for MY’s
2001 through 2006 reported theft rates
of 1.9146, 1.6011, 1.4482, 0.8102,
1.7298, and 1.3474 respectively for the
Nissan Pathfinder.

Nissan compared its device to other
similar devices previously granted
exemptions by the agency. Specifically,
it referenced the agency’s grant of full
exemptions to General Motors
Corporation for its Buick Riviera and
Oldsmobile Aurora vehicle lines (58 FR
44872, August 25, 1993) and its Cadillac
Seville vehicle line (62 FR 20058, April
24, 1997) from the parts-marking
requirements of the theft prevention
standard. Nissan stated it believes since
its device is functionally equivalent to
other comparable manufacturer’s
devices that have been granted parts
marking exemptions by the agency,
along with the evidence of reduced theft
rates for vehicles equipped with
similar devices and advanced
technology of transponder electronic
security, the Nissan immobilizer device
will have the potential to achieve the
level of effectiveness equivalent to those
vehicles already exempted by the
agency. The agency agrees the device is
substantially similar to devices installed on
other vehicle lines for which the
agency has already granted exemptions.

Based on the supporting evidence
submitted by Nissan, the agency
believes the antitheft device for the
Versa 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 (49 CFR part
541). The agency concludes the device
will provide four of the five types of
performance listed in § 543.6(a)[3]:
Promoting activation; 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.

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 33106 and 49
CFR 541.7(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
detering motor vehicle theft as
compliance with the parts-marking
requirements of Part 541. The agency
finds Nissan has provided adequate
reasons for its belief the antitheft device
for the Versa 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 (49 CFR part
541). This conclusion is based on the
information Nissan provided about its
device.

The agency notes that 49 CFR part
541, Appendix A–1, identifies those
types of vehicles that are exempted from the
Theft Prevention Standard for a given model
year. 49 CFR part 543.7(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 Nissan decides not to use the
exemption for this line, it must formally
notify the agency. If such a decision is
made, the line must be fully marked
according to the requirements under 49
CFR parts 541.5 and 541.6 (marking of
major component parts and replacement
parts).

NHTSA notes if Nissan 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. Part 543.7(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, Part
543.9(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 that exemption.”

The agency wishes to minimize the
administrative burden that Part
543.9(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 if
the manufacturer 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 Nissan’s petition
for exemption for the model year 2020
Nissan Versa vehicle line from the parts-
marking requirements of 49 CFR part
541.

Issued in Washington, DC, under authority
delegated in 49 CFR part 1.95 and 501.8.
Raymond R. Posten,
Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.
[FR Doc. 2019–05448 Filed 3–21–19; 8:45 am]
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DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials
Safety Administration
[Docket No. PHMSA–2019–0051]

Pipeline Safety: Information Collection
Activities—Request for Extension of
Existing Information Collections

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

ACTION: Notice and request for
comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the
Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995,
PHMSA invites comments on two
information collections that will be expiring in 2019. PHMSA will request
an extension, without change, for the information collections identified by OMB control number 2137–0578 and 2137–0605.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before May 21, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Comments 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.


Mail: Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, West Building, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590–0001.

Hand Delivery: Room W12–140 on the ground level of DOT, West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC, between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Instructions: Identify the docket number, PHMSA–2019–0051, at the beginning of your comments. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided. You should know that anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). Therefore, you may want to review DOT’s complete Privacy Act Statement in the Federal Register published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477) or visit http://www.regulations.gov before submitting any such comments.

Docket: For access to the docket or to read background documents or comments, go to http://www.regulations.gov at any time or to Room W12–140 on the ground level of DOT, West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC, between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. If you wish to receive confirmation of receipt of your written comments, please include a self-addressed, stamped postcard with the following statement: “Comments on PHMSA–2019–0051.” The Docket Clerk will date stamp the postcard prior to returning it to you via the U.S. mail. Please note that due to delays in the delivery of U.S. mail to federal offices in Washington, DC, we recommend that persons consider an alternative method (internet, fax, or professional delivery service) of submitting comments to the docket and ensuring their timely receipt at DOT.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 1320.8(d), Title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, requires PHMSA to provide interested members of the public and affected agencies an opportunity to comment on information collection and recordkeeping requests. This notice identifies two information collection requests that PHMSA will submit to OMB. PHMSA intends to request an extension, without change, of the information collection under OMB Control No. 2137–0578, which covers the reporting of safety-related conditions and OMB Control No. 2137–0605, which covers integrity management recordkeeping 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 will request a three-year term of approval for each information collection activity. PHMSA requests comments on the following information collections:

1. Title: Reporting Safety-Related Conditions on Gas, Hazardous Liquid, and Carbon Dioxide Pipelines and Liquefied Natural Gas Facilities.

OMB Control Number: 2137–0578.

Current Expiration Date: 8/31/2019.

Type of Request: Renewal of a currently approved information collection.

Abstract: Each operator of a pipeline facility (except master meter operators) must submit to DOT a written report on any safety-related condition that causes or has caused a significant change or restriction in the operation of a pipeline facility, or a condition that is a hazard to life, property or the environment.

Affected Public: Operators of pipeline facilities (except master meter operators).

Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden:

Estimated Number of Responses: 146.

Estimated Annual Burden Hours: 876.

Frequency of Collection: On occasion.

2. Title: Integrity Management in High Consequence Areas for Operators of Hazardous Liquid Pipelines.

OMB Control Number: 2137–0605.

Current Expiration Date: 10/31/2019.

Type of Request: Renewal of a currently approved information collection.

Abstract: Operators of hazardous liquid pipelines are required to have continual assessment and evaluation of pipeline integrity through inspection or testing, as well as remedial, preventive, and mitigative actions. This includes both recordkeeping and certain reporting requirements.

Affected Public: Operators of Hazardous Liquid Pipelines that could affect High Consequence Areas.

Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden:

Estimated Number of Responses: 203.

Estimated Annual Burden Hours: 325,470.

Frequency of Collection: Annually.

Comments are invited on:

(a) The need for the renewal of these collections of information 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.


Issued in Washington, DC, on March 18, 2019, under authority delegated in 49 CFR 1.97.

John A. Gale,
Director, Standards and Rulemaking Division.
[FR Doc. 2019–05491 Filed 3–21–19; 8:45 am]
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DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of Foreign Assets Control

Notice of OFAC Sanctions Action

AGENCY: Office of Foreign Assets Control, Treasury.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Treasury’s Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) is publishing the names of one or more persons that have been placed on OFAC’s Specially Designated