

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION****National Highway Traffic Safety Administration**

[Docket No. NHTSA–2014–0001; Notice 2]

**Cooper Tire & Rubber Company, Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance**

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

**ACTION:** Grant of Petition.

**SUMMARY:** Cooper Tire & Rubber Company (Cooper), has determined that certain Cooper light truck tires do not fully comply with paragraph S6.4 of Federal Motor Tire Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 119, *New Pneumatic Tires for Motor Vehicles with a GVWR of more than 4,536 kilograms (10,000 pounds) and Motorcycles*. Cooper has filed an appropriate report dated December 6, 2013 pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports*.

**ADDRESSES:** For further information on this decision contact Abraham Diaz, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), telephone (202) 366–5310, facsimile (202) 366–7002.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*I. Cooper's Petition:* Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) and the rule implementing those provisions at 49 CFR part 556, Cooper has petitioned for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

Notice of receipt of the petition was published, with a 30-day public comment period, on May 22, 2014 in the **Federal Register** (79 FR 29502). No comments were received. To view the petition, and all supporting documents log onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Web site at: <http://www.regulations.gov/>. Then follow the online search instructions to locate docket number "NHTSA–2014–0001."

*II. Tires Involved:* Affected are approximately 83,343 Mickey Thompson Baja MTZ brand LT315/70R17 Load Range D Tubeless tires manufactured from January 28, 2006 through October 31, 2013.

*III. Noncompliance:* Cooper explains that the noncompliance is that, due to a molding error, the subject tires were manufactured with only five of the six treadwear indicators required by paragraph S6.4 of FMVSS No. 119.

*IV. Rule Text:* Paragraph S6.4 of FMVSS No. 119 requires in pertinent part:

S6.4 *Treadwear Indicators.* Except as specified in this paragraph, each tire shall have at least six treadwear indicators spaced approximately equally around the circumference of the tire that enable a person inspecting the tire to determine visually whether the tire has worn to a tread depth of 1.6 mm (one-sixteenth of an inch). . . .

*V. Summary of Cooper's Analyses:* Cooper believes that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety because the absence of a single treadwear indicator has no practical effect on motor vehicle safety. Cooper supported this belief by stating that the presence of five of the six treadwear indicators provides ample coverage over the surface of the tire because consumers or technicians who attempt to inspect tread depth by relying on the treadwear indicators can easily see several of the indicators. In fact, when the vehicle is parked, only a small portion of the tread surface is not visible.

Therefore, Cooper believes that five treadwear indicators have an equivalent functionality of six indicators whether the tire is mounted on a vehicle or not.

Cooper also points out that NHTSA has previously granted other petitions that Cooper believes were similar to the subject petition.

Cooper has informed NHTSA that it has corrected the noncompliance so that all future production of these tires will comply with FMVSS No. 119.

In summation, Cooper believes that the described noncompliance of the subject tires is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that its petition, to exempt Cooper from providing recall notification of noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30118 and remedying the recall noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30120 should be granted.

**NHTSA Decision:**

*NHTSA Analysis:* The purpose for tire treadwear indicators is to serve as a means for a person to visually inspect a tire's tread depth and readily determine if a tire has worn to the extent that tread depth is 1.6 mm (one-sixteenth of an inch) or less.

Cooper stated that while the subject tires were molded with only five treadwear indicators that it believes that those indicators still provide ample coverage over the surface of the tire.

NHTSA agrees with Cooper that in this case the subject noncompliance will have no significant effect on the safety of the vehicles on which the subject tires are mounted. The subject tires have five indicators; 4 indicators spaced at 60

degrees and one indicator spaced at 120 degrees. NHTSA believes that in this case the absence of a single indicator does not significantly affect a person's ability to visually inspect a tire and readily recognize when a significant portion of the tire's tread is worn to the point that a tire should be replaced.

*NHTSA Decision:* In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that Cooper has met its burden of persuasion that the Cooper FMVSS No. 119 noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, Cooper's petition is hereby granted and Cooper is exempted from the obligation of providing notification of, and a remedy for, that noncompliance under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120.

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, this decision only applies to the subject noncompliant tires that Cooper no longer controlled at the time it determined that the noncompliance existed. However, the granting of 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 tires under their control after Cooper 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)

**Jeffrey M. Giuseppe,**

*Acting Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 2014–19602 Filed 8–18–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–59–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION****National Highway Traffic Safety Administration**

[Docket No. NHTSA–2013–0133; Notice 2]

**General Motors, LLC, Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance**

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

**ACTION:** Grant of petition.

**SUMMARY:** General Motors, LLC (GM) has determined that certain model year (MY) 2011, 2012 and 2013 Chevrolet Volt passenger cars sold with windshield sunshades as a “Limited Personalization Option,” do not fully comply with paragraph S4.3 of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. FMVSS 302, *Flammability of Interior Materials*. GM has filed an appropriate report dated August 27, 2013, pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports*.

**ADDRESSES:** For further information on this decision contact Mr. Mike Cole, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), telephone (202) 366-2334, facsimile (202) 366-5930.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*I. GM's Petition:* Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) and the rule implementing those provisions at 49 CFR part 556, GM has petitioned for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

Notice of receipt of the petition was published, with a 30-day public comment period, on January 21, 2014 in the **Federal Register** (79 FR 3471). No comments were received. To view the petition, and all supporting documents log onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Web site at: <http://www.regulations.gov/>. Then follow the online search instructions to locate docket number “NHTSA-2013-0133.”

*II. Vehicles Involved:* Affected are approximately 3,426 MY 2011, 2012 and 2013 Chevrolet Volt passenger cars that were manufactured from 12/14/2010 to 06/26/2013 and sold to retail customers with windshield sunshades as a “Limited Personalization Option.”

*III. Noncompliance:* GM explains that the noncompliance is that the subject vehicles were delivered as new vehicles to retail customers with windshield sunshades that do not meet the maximum burn rate requirement of paragraph S4.3 of FMVSS No. 302.

*IV. Rule Text:* Refer to the entire text of Paragraph S4 of FMVSS No. 302 for contextual restrictions as well as the specific requirements of subparagraph S4.3.

*V. Summary of GM's Analyses:* GM stated its belief that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety for the following reasons:

a. When tested as a finished part (i.e., with the inner and outer layers tested as though they form a composite), the sunshade's burn rate of 35mm/minute is significantly less than the FMVSS No. 302 maximum burn rate of 102 mm/minute. The outer layer is composed of self-extinguishing material that meets all of the requirements of FMVSS No. 302. While the layers of the assembly are not bonded at every point of contact, they are held together and encased with FMVSS No. 302 compliant self-extinguishing trim and stitching around the entire perimeter of the sunshade. Additional double rows of stitching create vertical accordion fold lines in the sunshade. The stitching segments the inner layer into smaller pieces that are separated by double layers of the FMVSS No. 302 compliant self-extinguishing outer layer material.

b. Only the inner layer, by itself, does not meet the FMVSS No. 302 burn rate, and at 110 mm/minute, it is only marginally above the 102 mm/minute requirement.

c. The sunshade has a storage bag which is made of FMVSS No. 302 compliant material. When the sunshade is stored in the provided bag while the vehicle is in use, the external surface that is presented to the occupant compartment is well within the FMVSS requirement, and two layers of FMVSS No. 302 compliant material would have to be penetrated to reach the marginally noncompliant inner layer.

d. Even if the sunshade was not placed in its storage bag when not in use, the external surface that is presented to the occupant compartment is still FMVSS compliant, and this layer would still need to be penetrated to reach the marginally noncompliant inner layer. In addition, folding it alone reduces the sunshade's surface area to approximately one eighth of the unfolded surface area, further reducing the exposure to any potential ignition source.

e. GM stated its belief that the purpose of FMVSS No. 302 is “to reduce the deaths and injuries to motor vehicle occupants caused by vehicle fires, especially those originating in the interior of the vehicle from sources such as matches or cigarettes.” FMVSS No. 302, paragraph S2. The sunshade is designed to be used only when the vehicle is parked, and it is extremely unlikely that the inner layer would ever come in contact with an ignition source. As such, it is extremely unlikely that a vehicle occupant would ever be exposed to a risk of injury as a result of the noncompliance.

f. Because the sunshade is intended to help reduce sun load during hot

weather conditions, it may be removed from the vehicle entirely during colder months, further reducing the exposure of the sunshade to the interior of the vehicle.

g. GM stated its belief that NHTSA has previously granted several inconsequential noncompliance petitions that GM believes can be applied to a decision on its petition. See GM's petition for a complete discussion of its reasoning.

h. There are no known field events involving ignition of sunshades. GM is not aware of any crashes, injuries or customer complaints involving this windshield sunshade.

GM has additionally informed NHTSA that it has corrected the noncompliance so that all future production vehicles delivered with windshield sunshades will comply with FMVSS No. 302.

In summation, GM believes that the described noncompliance of the subject vehicles is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that its petition, to exempt from providing recall notification of noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30118 and remedying the recall noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30120 should be granted.

*NHTSA Decision:*

*NHTSA Analysis:* NHTSA agrees with GM that the noncompliant corrugated plastic material incorporated into the subject sunshades is unlikely to pose a flammability risk due to: the unlikelihood of exposure to an ignition source; the fact that the noncompliant material is fully encased by materials which comply with the flammability requirements of FMVSS No. 302; the fact that the sunshade is provided with a bag made of materials that comply with the flammability requirements of FMVSS No. 302 for storage of the sunshade when the vehicle is in use; and the fact that when tested separately the inner layer is only marginally above the 102 mm/minute requirement.

*NHTSA Decision:* In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that GM has met its burden of persuasion that the FMVSS No. 302 noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, GM's petition is hereby granted and GM is exempted from the obligation of providing notification of, and a remedy for, that noncompliance under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120.

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, this decision only applies to the subject noncompliant vehicles that GM no longer controlled at the time it determined that the noncompliance existed. However, the granting of 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 GM 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)

**Jeffrey M. Giuseppe,**

*Acting Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 2014-19603 Filed 8-18-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Surface Transportation Board

[Docket No. FD 35804 (Sub-No. 1)]

#### **CSX Transportation, Inc., The Baltimore & Ohio Chicago Terminal Railroad Company, and Norfolk Southern Railway Company—Joint Relocation Project Exemption—Gary-Chicago International Airport Authority**

**AGENCY:** Surface Transportation Board, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of Exemption.

**SUMMARY:** The Board is granting an exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502 from the prior approval requirements of 49 U.S.C. 11323-25 for CSX Transportation, Inc., to obtain trackage rights from Norfolk Southern Railway Company (NSR) over a 1.7-mile portion of NSR's Gary Branch between approximately milepost TC 244.90 and milepost TC 246.60.<sup>1</sup>

**DATES:** This exemption is effective on August 14, 2014. Petitions to reopen must be filed by September 3, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to Docket No. FD 35804 (Sub-No. 1), must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board, 395 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20423-

<sup>1</sup> This transaction is related to the joint relocation project described in *CSX Transportation, The Baltimore & Ohio Chicago Terminal Co., & Norfolk Southern Railway—Joint Relocation Project Exemption—Gary-Chicago International Airport Authority*, FD 35804 (STB served May 21, 2014).

0001. In addition, a copy of each pleading must be served on Louis E. Gitomer, Law Offices of Louis E. Gitomer, 600 Baltimore Avenue, Suite 301, Towson, MD 21204.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Valerie Quinn, (202) 245-0382.

Assistance for the hearing impaired is available through the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at (800) 877-8339.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Additional information is contained in the Board's decision served on August 14, 2014, which is available on our Web site at [www.stb.dot.gov](http://www.stb.dot.gov).

Decided: August 14, 2014.

By the Board, Chairman Elliott, Vice Chairman Miller, and Commissioner Begeman.

**Jeffrey Herzig,**

*Clearance Clerk.*

[FR Doc. 2014-19635 Filed 8-18-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4915-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Office of Foreign Assets Control

#### **Publication of Iran General License G**

**AGENCY:** Office of Foreign Assets Control, Treasury.

**ACTION:** Notice, publication of general license.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) published in the **Federal Register** General License G, which was issued under the Iranian transactions sanctions program on March 19, 2014. General License G authorizes certain academic exchanges between U.S. academic institutions and Iranian universities and the exportation or importation of certain educational services.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* March 19, 2014.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Assistant Director for Licensing, tel.: 202-622-2480, Assistant Director for Policy, tel.: 202-622-2402, Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, tel.: 202-622-4855, Assistant Director for Sanctions Compliance & Evaluation, tel.: 202-622-2490, Office of Foreign Assets Control, or Chief Counsel (Foreign Assets Control), tel.: 202-622-2410, Office of the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury (not toll free numbers).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### **Electronic and Facsimile Availability**

The text of General License G and additional information concerning

OFAC are available on OFAC's Web site ([www.treasury.gov/ofac](http://www.treasury.gov/ofac)). Certain general information pertaining to OFAC's sanctions programs also is available via facsimile through a 24-hour fax-on-demand service, tel.: 202/622-0077.

#### **Background**

On March 19, 2014, OFAC issued General License G authorizing certain academic exchanges between U.S. academic institutions and Iranian universities and the exportation or importation of certain educational services. On March 20, 2014, OFAC made General License G available on the OFAC Web site ([www.treasury.gov/ofac](http://www.treasury.gov/ofac)). With this notice, OFAC is publishing General License G in the **Federal Register**.

#### **General License G**

##### *Certain Academic Exchanges and the Exportation or Importation of Certain Educational Services Authorized*

(a) *Academic Exchanges.* Except as provided in paragraph (c) of this general license, accredited graduate and undergraduate degree-granting academic institutions located in the United States (collectively, "U.S. academic institutions"), including their contractors, are authorized to enter into student academic exchange agreements with universities located in Iran (collectively, "Iranian universities") related to undergraduate or graduate educational courses, and to engage in all activities related to such agreements, including, but not limited to, the provision of scholarships to students enrolled in Iranian universities to allow such students to attend U.S. academic institutions.

(b) *Educational Services.* Except as provided in paragraph (c) of this general license,

(1) U.S. academic institutions, including their contractors, are authorized to export services:

(i) In connection with the filing and processing of applications and the acceptance of payments for submitted applications and tuition from or on behalf of individuals who are located in Iran, or located outside Iran but who are ordinarily resident in Iran;

(ii) related to the recruitment, hiring, or employment in a teaching capacity of individuals who are located in Iran, or located outside Iran but who are ordinarily resident in Iran, and regularly employed in a teaching capacity at an Iranian university, provided that no such individuals are employed in a teaching capacity within the United States without being granted appropriate visas by the U.S.