

destination countries? Does the government provide adequate assistance to repatriated victims after their return to their countries of origin, and if so, what forms of assistance?

24. Does the government inappropriately detain or imprison trafficking victims? Does the government punish, penalize, or detain trafficking victims for unlawful acts committed as a result of being subjected to trafficking, such as forgery of documents, illegal immigration, unauthorized employment, prostitution, theft, or drug production or transport? Does law enforcement screen for trafficking victims when arresting individuals in prostitution?

25. What efforts has the government made to prevent human trafficking? Are there laws prohibiting employers or labor agents from confiscating workers' passports or travel documents, switching contracts without the workers' consent, or withholding payment of salaries as a means of keeping workers in a state of compelled service? Are these laws implemented to hold violators accountable and/or are such crimes investigated by law enforcement as potential indicators of trafficking?

26. Do authorities conduct criminal investigations when indicators of trafficking are identified in the context of labor inspections?

27. Does the government operate a hotline for potential victims? If so, how many calls did the hotline receive? What are the hours of operation? What languages are spoken? How many potential victims were identified and cases referred to law enforcement as a result of calls to the hotline?

28. Has the government entered into effective bilateral, multilateral, or regional information-sharing and cooperation arrangements that have resulted in concrete and measurable outcomes?

29. Did the government provide assistance to other governments in combating trafficking in persons through trainings or other assistance programs?

30. Does the government have effective policies or laws regulating foreign labor recruitment, including the activities of recruitment and placement agencies and individual recruiters, both licensed and unlicensed? What did the government do to regulate recruitment practices that are known to contribute to trafficking in persons? Specifically, did the government prohibit (in any context) charging workers recruitment fees? Also indicate if the government prohibited the recruitment of workers through knowingly fraudulent job offers

(including misrepresenting wages, working conditions, location, or nature of the job), contract switching, confiscating or otherwise denying workers access to their identity documents, or recruitment of workers in hazardous or unsafe work? What steps did the government take to minimize the trafficking risks faced by migrant workers departing from or arriving in the country and to raise awareness among potential labor migrants about the risks of human trafficking, legal limits on recruitment fees, or their rights while abroad? What agreements does the government have with either sending or receiving countries of migrant labor regarding safe and responsible recruitment? Are domestic workers (both nationals of the country and foreign nationals) protected under existing labor laws?

31. What measures has the government taken to reduce the participation by nationals of the country in international and domestic child sex tourism? If any of the country's nationals are perpetrators of child sex tourism, do the country's child sexual abuse laws allow the prosecution of suspected sex tourists for crimes committed abroad?

32. What measures did the government take to establish the identity of local populations, including birth registration and issuance of documentation, citizenship, and nationality?

33. Did the government fund any anti-trafficking information, education, or awareness campaigns or training? Were these campaigns or trainings targeting potential trafficking victims, potential first responders or other trusted authorities, known trafficking sectors or vulnerabilities, and/or the demand for human trafficking (e.g. buyers of commercial sex or goods produced with forced labor)? Does the government provide financial support to nongovernment organizations working to promote public awareness?

34. Were there government policies, regulations, and agreements relating to migration, labor, trade, and investment that had an impact, positive or negative, on forced labor or sex trafficking or vulnerabilities to such crimes? Please describe how this has impacted anti-trafficking efforts.

35. Please provide additional information and/or recommendations to improve the government's anti-trafficking efforts.

36. Please highlight effective strategies and practices that other governments could consider adopting.

Kari A. Johnstone,

Acting Director, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, Department of State.

[FR Doc. 2019-26520 Filed 12-9-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-17-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2018-0104, Notice 1]

Spartan Motors USA, Inc., Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Receipt of petition.

SUMMARY: Spartan Motors USA, Inc. (Spartan), has determined that certain model year (MY) 2017-2019 Spartan Emergency Response Gladiator and Metro Star chassis do not fully comply with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 121, *Air Brake Systems*. Spartan filed a noncompliance report dated December 26, 2018, subsequently petitioned NHTSA on November 12, 2018, and amended on July 31, 2019, for a decision that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety. This document announces receipt of petition and offers the opportunity for public comment.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the petition is January 9, 2020.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on this petition. Comments must refer to the docket number and notice number cited in the title of this notice and may be submitted by any of the following methods:

- **Mail:** Send comments by mail addressed to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.

- **Hand Delivery:** Deliver comments by hand to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. except for Federal Holidays.

- **Electronically:** Submit comments electronically by logging onto the

Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) website at <https://www.regulations.gov/>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

- Comments may also be faxed to (202) 493-2251.

Comments must be written in the English language, and be no greater than 15 pages in length, although there is no limit to the length of necessary attachments to the comments. If comments are submitted in hard copy form, please ensure that two copies are provided. If you wish to receive confirmation that comments you have submitted by mail were received, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard with the comments. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to https://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided.

All comments and supporting materials received before the close of business on the closing date indicated above will be filed in the docket and will be considered. All comments and supporting materials received after the closing date will also be filed and will be considered to the fullest extent possible.

When the petition is granted or denied, notice of the decision also will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated at the end of this notice.

All comments, background documentation, and supporting materials submitted to the docket may be viewed by anyone at the address and times given above. The documents may also be viewed on the internet at https://www.regulations.gov by following the online instructions for accessing the dockets. The docket ID number for this petition is shown in the heading of this notice.

DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement is available for review in a **Federal Register** notice published on April 11, 2000, (65 FR 19477-78).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Overview: Spartan has determined that certain MY 2017-2019 Spartan Emergency Response Gladiator and Metro Star chassis cabs do not fully comply with paragraph S5.3.3.1(a) of FMVSS No. 121, *Air Brake Systems* (49 CFR 571.121). Spartan filed a noncompliance report dated December 26, 2018, pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports*. Spartan subsequently petitioned NHTSA on November 12, 2018 (and amended this petition on July 31, 2019) seeking exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C.

Chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) and 49 CFR part 556, *Exemption for Inconsequential Defect or Noncompliance*.

This notice of receipt of Spartan's petition is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any Agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the petition.

II. Chassis Cabs Involved:

Approximately 15 MY 2017-2019 Spartan Emergency Response Gladiator and Metro Star chassis cabs manufactured between November 16, 2016, and October 30, 2018, are potentially involved.

III. Noncompliance: Spartan described the noncompliance as the service brake application timing exceeds the 0.45 timing requirement as specified in paragraph S5.3.3.1(a) of FMVSS No. 121.

IV. Rule Requirements: Paragraph S5.3.3 of FMVSS No. 121 includes the requirements relevant to this petition. Each service brake system shall meet the requirements of paragraph S5.3.3.1(a). With an initial service reservoir system air pressure of 100 psi, the air pressure in each brake chamber shall, when measured from the first movement of the service brake control, reach 60 psi in not more than 0.45 seconds in the case of trucks and buses.

V. Summary of Spartan's Petition:

Spartan described the subject noncompliance and stated its belief that the noncompliance is inconsequential as it related to motor vehicle safety.

In support of its petition, Spartan submitted the following reasoning:

1. Section 5.3.3.1 of FMVSS No. 121 defines the amount of pressure (60 psi) that must be achieved in front brake chambers. Further, it also defines a "not to exceed" time (0.45 seconds) in which that pressure at the brake chamber must be achieved. This is not interpreted to mean brakes are to be applied at 60 psi but rather a certain pressure at the brake chamber will be achieved. Brakes will be applied nearly instantaneously after actuation of the treadle valve.

2. Spartan conducted three tests on a sample chassis cab of similar brake system configuration to those subject to the identified noncompliance. The reported average was used to determine the actual results in comparison to the requirements. By rounding the average of the three tests for each sample, Spartan identified it exceeds the requirements by 0.04-0.05 seconds.

3. The measurement of time, in this case, is for when air pressure at the

chamber reaches 60 psi. As stated, the brakes are still being applied irrespective of achieving the 60 psi pressure at the front brake chambers. The impact of being 0.044 to 0.05 seconds above the requirement of 0.45 seconds would have very little impact (approximately 4ft @60 mph) to stopping distance of the vehicle and would not impede the capability of the vehicle being able to stop.

4. According to the Driver's License Manual, stopping distance is impacted by driver perception distance and reaction distance. Other factors include speed and gross weight of the vehicle. These attributes would appear to have a more significant impact on overall stopping distance, than 0.05 seconds of timing, for the air pressure to reach 60 psi at the front brake chambers.

5. From a speed of 60 mph, vehicles affected by this condition are required to achieve a complete stop in 310 feet. It would take approximately 3.52 seconds for vehicles to stop at this rate of speed. Vehicles affected by the condition that has resulted in the identified noncompliance as capable of stopping, within the distance of 310 feet, as prescribed by FMVSS No. 121 and would still be able to stop within the required stopping distance.

Spartan concluded by expressing the belief that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety, and that 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 Spartan 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 Spartan 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. 2019-26527 Filed 12-9-19; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

[Docket No. PHMSA-2017-0157]

Pipeline Safety: Request for Special Permit; Alaska Gasline Development Corporation

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

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: PHMSA is publishing this notice to solicit public comment on a request for special permit, seeking relief from compliance with certain requirements in the Federal pipeline safety regulations (PSRs). At the conclusion of the 60-day comment period, PHMSA will review the comments received from this notice as part of its evaluation to grant or deny the special permit request.

DATES: Submit any comments regarding this special permit request by February 10, 2020.

ADDRESSES: Comments should reference the docket number for the specific special permit request and 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 System: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.
- *Hand Delivery:* Docket Management System: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590, between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Instructions: You should identify the docket number for the special permit request you are commenting on at the beginning of your comments. If you submit your comments by mail, please submit two copies. To receive

confirmation that PHMSA has received your comments, please include a self-addressed stamped postcard. Internet users may submit comments at <http://www.Regulations.gov>.

Note: There is a privacy statement published on <http://www.Regulations.gov>. Comments, including any personal information provided, are posted without changes or edits to <http://www.Regulations.gov>.

Confidential Business Information: Confidential Business Information (CBI) is commercial or financial information that is both customarily and actually treated as private by its owner. Under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) (5 U.S.C. 552), CBI is exempt from public disclosure. If your comments responsive to this notice contain commercial or financial information that is customarily treated as private, that you actually treat as private, and that is relevant or responsive to this notice, it is important that you clearly designate the submitted comments as CBI. Pursuant to 49 Code of **Federal Register** (CFR) § 190.343, you may ask PHMSA to give confidential treatment to information you give to the agency by taking the following steps: (1) Mark each page of the original document submission containing CBI as "Confidential"; (2) send PHMSA, along with the original document, a second copy of the original document with the CBI deleted; and (3) explain why the information you are submitting is CBI. Unless you are notified otherwise, PHMSA will treat such marked submissions as confidential under the FOIA, and they will not be placed in the public docket of this notice. Submissions containing CBI should be sent to Kay McIver, DOT, PHMSA PHP-80, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590-0001. Any commentary PHMSA receives that is not specifically designated as CBI will be placed in the public docket for this matter.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

General: Ms. Kay McIver by telephone at 202-366-0113, or by email at kay.mciver@dot.gov.

Technical: Mr. Joseph Sieve by telephone at 202-366-5064, or by email at joseph.sieve@dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

PHMSA received a special permit request from the Alaska Gasline Development Corporation (AGDC) to deviate from the PSRs in 49 CFR 193.2167 and 193.2173 in order to use pipe-in-pipe (PIP) technology at various segments of their proposed liquefied natural gas (LNG) product and LNG quench lines.

AGDC is proposing to construct, own, and operate one integrated natural gas pipeline with gas pre-treatment facilities, interdependent interconnection gas delivery points, and a liquefaction and marine export facility, (collectively known as the Alaska LNG Project) for the purpose of liquefying supplies of natural gas from Alaska. Gas would be supplied from the Point Thomson Unit and Prudhoe Bay Unit production fields on the North Slope, and provide opportunities for in-state deliveries of natural gas and export of LNG in foreign commerce. PHMSA has prescribed the minimum PSRs for LNG facilities in compliance with 49 U.S.C. 60101 et. seq. Those standards are codified in 49 CFR part 193 and apply to the siting, design, construction, operation, maintenance, and security of LNG facilities.

The Alaska LNG Terminal would include LNG rundown lines, which would transfer LNG from the liquefaction units to the LNG storage tanks. These lines would be constructed using PIP technology, which would be designed to contain releases from the inner pipe within an enclosed secondary outer pipe. The three 20-inch diameter PIP rundown lines would start at the outlet line of each liquefaction train and combine to a 30-inch diameter rundown header, which transfers LNG to the storage tanks. The 30-inch diameter PIP rundown header transitions to conventional stainless steel piping in the LNG storage tank area before branching to two (2) tank loading lines. Additionally, AGDC proposes to use PIP technology for four (4) LNG quench lines (two (2) supply and two (2) return lines) that would be used to cool down the boil-off gas. Four-inch (4-inch) diameter quench lines would be connected to the dual 28-inch diameter LNG marine cargo transfer lines using fabricated PIP tees. The quench lines would continue to the northern edge of the boil-off gas compressor unit spill collection area where the PIP transitions to conventional stainless steel piping near the boil-off gas compressors.

The request, proposed special permit with conditions, and Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for the AGDC LNG Terminal pipeline are available for review and public comment in the Docket No. PHMSA-2017-0157. We invite interested persons to review and submit comments on the special permit request and DEA in the docket. Please include any comments on potential safety and environmental impacts that may result if the special permit is granted. Comments may include relevant data.