enough. This search is current as of May 29, 2019.

3. In similar situations, NHTSA has granted petitions for inconsequential noncompliance relating to the subject requirement of FMVSS No. 108.

NHTSA has previously granted at least two similar petitions for inconsequential noncompliance, one for a tail lamp and one for a side reflex reflector assembly. A brief summary of the decisions is provided below:

• Hella, 55 FR 37601, (September 12, 1990)

In the petition, Hella argued that industry experience and supporting studies have established that the human eye in the vast majority of cases cannot detect a change in luminescence unless it is more than a 25 percent increase or decrease. NHTSA stated that a reduction of approximately 25 percent in luminous intensity is required before the human eye can detect the difference between two lamps. Of the noncompliant lamps tested, the greatest disparity reported between a compliant lamp and a noncompliant lamp was 3.6 cd, which is a 20 percent higher luminous intensity than compliant lamps. According to the SAE Recommended Practice J576, this differential cannot be detected by the human eye. For this reason, the Hella petition was granted.

• Subaru, 56 FR 59971, (November 26, 1991)

Subaru submitted a petition for inconsequential noncompliance in 1991 concerning the failures of luminous intensity on the side reflex reflector. NHTSA considered the petitioner's statement that observers could not differentiate between the reflected light of complying and noncomplying reflectors at distances of 30m, 60m, and 100m. As the agency noted in 1990 when it granted an inconsequentiality petition filed by Hella, Inc., "a reduction of approximately 25 percent in luminous intensity is required before the human eye can detect the difference between two lamps." See 55 FR 37601, 37602. The agency applied the same considerations to reflectors as to lamps. The luminous transmittance failures of the Subaru reflectors were all less than 20 percent of the minimum values specified by the standard, and, therefore, they were undetectable by the naked eye. For this reason, the petition was granted.

Toyota 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 Toyota 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 Toyota 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. 2019–24303 Filed 11–6–19; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2018-0110; Notice 1]

Great Dane, LLC, Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

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

SUMMARY: Great Dane, LLC (Great Dane) has determined that certain model year (MY) 2019 Great Dane Freedom Platform trailers do not comply with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSS) No. 223, Rear Impact Guards, and FMVSS No. 224, Rear Impact Protection. Great Dane filed a noncompliance report dated January 2, 2019, and subsequently petitioned NHTSA on January 2, 2019, for a decision that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety. This document announces receipt of Great Dane's petition.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the petition is December 9, 2019. **ADDRESSES:** Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on this petition. Comments must refer to the docket 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 will also 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: Great Dane has determined that certain MY 2019 Great Dane Freedom Platform trailers do not fully comply with paragraph S5.3 of FMVSS No. 223, Rear Impact Guards (49 CFR 571.223), and paragraph S5.1 of FMVSS No 224, Rear Impact Protection (49 CFR 571.224). Great Dane filed a noncompliance report dated January 2, 2019, pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, Defect and Noncompliance *Responsibility and Reports,* and subsequently petitioned NHTSA on January 2, 2019, for an 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 their 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. Trailers Involved: Approximately 72 MY 2019 Great Dane Freedom Platform trailers, manufactured between July 10, 2018, and November 8, 2018, are potentially involved.

III. Noncompliance: Great Dane explained that the noncompliance is that the subject trailers were manufactured with a rear impact guard that does not contain the certification plate as required by paragraphs S5.3 of FMVSS No. 223 and S5.1 of FMVSS No. 224.

IV. Rule Text: Paragraphs S5.3 of FMVSS No. 223 and S5.1 of FMVSS No. 224 include the requirements relevant to this petition. Each guard shall be permanently labeled with the information specified in paragraphs S5.3(a) through (c) of FMVSS No. 223. The information shall be in English and in letters that are at least 2.5mm high. The label shall be placed on the forward or rearward facing surface of the horizontal member of the guard, provided that the label does not interfere with the retroreflective sheeting required by S5.7.1.4.1(c) of FMVSS No. 108 (49 CFR 571.108), and is readily accessible for visual

inspection and includes the following: (a) The guard manufacturer's name and address, (b) the statement: "Manufactured in ____" (inserting the month and year of guard manufacture), and (c) the letters "DOT," constituting a certification by the guard manufacturer that the guard conforms to all requirements of this standard. FMVSS No. 224 requires that each vehicle shall be equipped with a rear impact guard certified as meeting FMVSS No. 223.

V. Summary of Great Dane's Petition: The following views and arguments presented in this section, V. Summary of Great Dane's Petition, are the views and arguments provided by Great Dane. They have not been evaluated by the agency and do not reflect the views of the agency.

Accordingly, Great Dane described the subject noncompliance and stated that the noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety.

1. Great Dane believes that the lack of the impact guard certification plate, is an inconsequential type of noncompliance as it relates to vehicle safety. The fact that the certification plate was not installed on the rear impact guard on this particular group of trailers does not make these trailers any less safe.

2. Great Dane stated that these rear impact guards as manufactured and installed by Great Dane, are compliant as required by the Federal Standard.

3. The subject trailers have affixed to them certification plates, certifying that the entire trailer, including the rear impact guard, meet and/or exceed all the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards in effect, on the date of manufacture as indicated.

4. To meet the standards of FMVSS 223 and 224, Great Dane has never installed a third party produced rear impact guard on any of its trailers.

5. The incident that lead to these trailers being produced without the plate attached was an isolated incident. It has since been investigated, resolved, and should not occur again in the future.

6. Great Dane believes that the extra certification plate required on the rear impact guard is redundant.

Great Dane 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 trailers that Great Dane 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 trailers under their control after Great Dane 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. 2019–24302 Filed 11–6–19; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of Foreign Assets Control

Notice of OFAC Sanctions Actions

AGENCY: Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury. **ACTION:** Notice.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) is publishing the names of one or more persons that have been removed from OFAC's Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons List (SDN List). Their property and interests in property are no longer blocked, and U.S. persons are no longer generally prohibited from engaging in transactions with them.

DATES: See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

OFAC: Associate Director for Global Targeting, tel: 202–622–2420; Assistant Director for Licensing, tel.: 202–622– 2480; Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, tel.: 202–622–4855; Assistant Director for Sanctions Compliance & Evaluation, tel.: 202–622–2490; or the Department of the Treasury's Office of the General Counsel: Office of the Chief Counsel (Foreign Assets Control), tel.: 202–622–2410.