

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 deterring theft. Nissan referenced the National Insurance Crime Bureau's data, which it stated showed a 70% reduction in theft when comparing 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 and subsequent years 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, 1.8011, 1.1482, 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 vehicle lines 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 543.7(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 deterring 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 lines 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]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

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.

Fax: 1–202–493–2251.

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.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Angela Hill by telephone at 202–366–1246, by fax at 202–366–4566, or by mail at DOT, PHMSA, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, PHP–30, Washington, DC 20590–0001.

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.

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 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]

BILLING CODE 4910–60–P

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