

B. Response to Forest River's Arguments

NHTSA reviewed Forest River's arguments that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Forest River contends that the emergency egress label for the rear window exit being located 25 centimeters distant from the two red dual release mechanisms, rather than within the 16 centimeters required by FMVSS No. 217, poses little, if any, risk to motor vehicle safety. NHTSA does not agree, as described below:

The purpose of FMVSS No. 217 is to minimize the likelihood of occupants being thrown from the bus and to provide a means of *readily accessible emergency egress* (emphasis added) (See 49 CFR 571.217 S2). The requirements at S5.5.1, *Emergency Exit Identification*, of FMVSS No. 217, at issue here, are specific to identifying emergency exits, identifying the release mechanism(s) for emergency exits, and the associated operating instructions for the release mechanism(s). These requirements are threefold: (1) An exit must be identified as an "Emergency Exit," (2) the identification as an "Emergency Exit" must be followed by "concise operating instructions," and (3) both the "Emergency Exit" identification and "concise operating instructions" must be located "within 16 centimeters" of the release mechanism(s) for the associated emergency exit. In the present case, the rear emergency window is identified as an "Emergency Exit" via a sole label centered along the rear emergency window. However, this sole label fails to meet the other two requirements of S5.5.1—the label does not contain "concise operating instructions describing each motion necessary to unlatch and open the exit," and the label is not "within 16 centimeters of the release mechanism." These two points are further discussed below.

Regarding the instructions, the rear emergency exit window has two release mechanisms which operate independently of each other. As such, both mechanisms need to be operated to open the emergency exit window. The petitioner installed one label centered along the window that, in part, reads: "Pull red handle up. Push window out." These instructions are incomplete, as they only reference a single red handle. Following the instructions on the label, a passenger would operate one release mechanism and attempt to push the window out. However, the emergency exit window would not open, as the second release mechanism would remain latched. As such, we are not persuaded by Forest River's statement

that the instructions on how to operate the release mechanism are concise and understandable as currently installed, because there are indeed two such mechanisms that must be used for the emergency exit to open.

Regarding the location, the sole label is centered along the rear emergency exit window, with its outermost edge located at a distance of 25 cm from the nearest edge of the release mechanism. In its petition, Forest River argues that because the color of the release mechanism contrasts with the window frame and hardware, and the label is centered in the window and unobstructed, the label "should be readily apparent to passengers." As a result of this presumption by Forest River, it concludes that the location of the label does not compromise safety with regard to a passenger's ability to identify an emergency egress location. However, the fundamental issue in this instance is not the identification of the emergency egress location, rather it is the identification of the two release mechanism locations. As such, NHTSA is not persuaded by Forest River's presumptive argument that the location of this label does not compromise safety, because it does not address the identification of the two release mechanism locations or state that both handles must be pulled.

Regarding the bus driver, NHTSA does not accept Forest River's argument that transit bus drivers can always be counted on to assist passenger emergency egress. The condition or availability of the bus driver is highly dependent on the severity of the event.

C. Remaining Arguments

Forest River referenced two inconsequential noncompliance petitions NHTSA had previously granted to support its petition. According to Forest River, these petitions had a direct and serious impact on safety. The first petition, from New Flyer of America, Inc. (see 63 FR 32694), involved transit buses that had only one emergency exit on the right side of the bus instead of two, as required. These buses had 3.28 times the required exit area, with two emergency exit windows on the left side, one emergency exit window on the right side and two roof exits. Thus, the buses had the minimum number of emergency exits required by FMVSS No. 217. However, these exits were not distributed properly. Instead of a second emergency exit on the right side, these buses had an additional roof exit. The agency decided that the additional roof exit provided for an additional level of safety during a rollover event, and

granted the petition. NHTSA does not agree that granting this prior petition supports Forest River's arguments in this case. Here, the issue is identifying the emergency exit release mechanisms and their operation.

The second petition cited by Forest River involved two side emergency exit doors located opposite each other and within the same post and roof bow panel space. That petition argued that the requirement prohibiting two exit doors from being located opposite each other appeared to be related to the structural integrity of a bus body with this configuration. The petitioner indicated that it had no reports of any structural failures in the area around the emergency doors, but stated that it would extend to owners of the noncompliant vehicles a 15-year warranty for any structural or panel failures related to the location of the doors. NHTSA agreed with the petitioner that in that case, the noncompliance did not compromise safety in terms of emergency exit capability in proportion to maximum occupant capacity, access to side emergency doors, visibility of the exits, or the ability of bus occupants to exit after an accident. Again, NHTSA does not agree that granting this prior petition supports granting Forest River's petition here, because the identification of the emergency exits in that case was not at issue.

VII. NHTSA's Decision

In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA finds that Forest River has not met its burden of persuasion that the subject FMVSS No. 217 noncompliance in the affected vehicles is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, Forest River's petition is hereby denied and Forest River is obligated to provide notification of, and a free remedy for, that noncompliance under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120.

(Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.95 and 501.8)

Joseph Kolly,

Acting Associate Administrator for Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 2021-22003 Filed 10-7-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

List of Countries Requiring Cooperation With an International Boycott

In accordance with section 999(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986,

the Department of the Treasury is publishing a current list of countries which require or may require participation in, or cooperation with, an international boycott (within the meaning of section 999(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

On the basis of the best information currently available to the Department of the Treasury, the following countries require or may require participation in, or cooperation with, an international boycott (within the meaning of section

999(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

- Iraq
- Kuwait
- Lebanon
- Libya
- Qatar
- Saudi Arabia
- Syria
- Yemen

Kevin Nichols,
International Tax Counsel, (Tax Policy).
 [FR Doc. 2021-22027 Filed 10-7-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-AK-P

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Advisory Committee on the Readjustment of Veterans, Notice of Meeting, Amended

The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) gives notice under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App. 2, that the Advisory Committee on the Readjustment of Veterans will hold three virtual meetings. The meetings will begin and end as follows:

Date	Time	Open session
October 18, 2021	9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST	Yes.
October 19, 2021	9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST	Yes.
October 20, 2021	9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. EST	Yes.

The meeting sessions are open to public.

The purpose of the Committee is to advise the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) regarding the provision by VA of benefits and services to assist Veterans in the readjustment to civilian life. In carrying out this duty, the Committee shall take into account the needs of Veterans who served in combat theaters of operation. The Committee assembles, reviews, and assesses information relating to the needs of Veterans readjusting to civilian life and the effectiveness of VA services in assisting Veterans in that readjustment.

The Committee, comprised of 13 subject matter experts, advises the Secretary, through the VA Readjustment Counseling Service, on the provision by VA of benefits and services to assist Veterans in the readjustment to civilian

life. In carrying out this duty, the Committee assembles, reviews, and assesses information relating to the needs of Veterans readjusting to civilian life and the effectiveness of VA services in assisting Veterans in that readjustment, specifically taking into account the needs of Veterans who served in combat theaters of operation.

For public members wishing to join the meeting, please use the following Webex link: <https://veteransaffairs.webex.com/webappng/sites/veteransaffairs/meeting/download/d83ece0e56744b8ba40bbfa197756d6a?siteurl=veteransaffairs&MTID=mec58f4a2bdcbef7b8ac65c9b1e4f72597>.

No time will be allotted for receiving oral comments from the public; however, the committee will accept written comments from interested

parties on issues outlined in the meeting agenda or other issues regarding the readjustment of Veterans. Parties should contact Mr. Richard Barbato via email at VHA10RCSAction@va.gov, or Department of Veterans Affairs, Readjustment Counseling Service (10RCS), 810 Vermont Avenue, Washington, DC 20420. Any member of the public seeking additional information should contact Mr. Barbato at the phone number or email addressed noted above.

Dated: October 5, 2021.

Jelessa M. Burney,
Federal Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 2021-22050 Filed 10-7-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P