

seizure medication with the dosage and frequency remaining the same since 2021. Their physician states that they are supportive of Adam Brunson receiving an exemption.

Alan Glinsmann

Alan Glinsmann is a 65-year-old class AM CDL holder in Kansas. They have a history of post traumatic seizures and have been seizure free since January 1981. They take anti-seizure medication with the dosage and frequency remaining the same since 1983. Their physician states that they are supportive of Alan Glinsmann receiving an exemption.

Alex Hunter

Alex Hunter is a 61-year-old class 1 license holder in South Dakota. They have a history of generalized idiopathic epilepsy and have been seizure free since January 2015. They take anti-seizure medication with the dosage and frequency remaining the same since 2018. Their physician states that they are supportive of Alex Hunter receiving an exemption.

Kyle Jones

Kyle Jones is a 54-year-old class A CDL holder in Indiana. They have a history of seizure disorder and have been seizure free since 2012. They have not taken anti-seizure medication since 2014. Their physician states that they are supportive of Kyle Jones receiving an exemption.

Ryan McKnelly

Ryan McKnelly is a 45-year-old class A CDL holder in South Dakota. They have a history of generalized idiopathic epilepsy and have been seizure free since 2001. They take anti-seizure medication with the dosage and frequency remaining the same since 2003. Their physician states that they are supportive of Ryan McKnelly receiving an exemption.

Alfonso V. Mendoza

Alfonso V. Mendoza is a 33-year-old class C license holder in California. They have a history of seizure disorder and have been seizure free since December 2008. They take anti-seizure medication with the dosage and frequency remaining the same since 2008. Their physician states that they are supportive of Alfonso V. Mendoza receiving an exemption.

Jerrid Pace

Jerrid Pace is a 33-year-old class A CDL holder in Tennessee. They have a history of complex partial seizure and have been seizure free since 2015. They

take anti-seizure medication with the dosage and frequency remaining the same since 2013. Their physician states that they are supportive of Jerrid Pace receiving an exemption.

Elsa Santo

Elsa Santo is a 62-year-old class B license holder in New Jersey. They have a history of epilepsy and have been seizure free since May 2015. They take anti-seizure medication with the dosage and frequency remaining the same since November 2015. Their physician states that they are supportive of Elsa Santo receiving an exemption.

Brandon Schindele

Brandon Schindele is a 39-year-old class D license holder in Minnesota. They have a history of seizure disorder and have been seizure free since 1995. They take anti-seizure medication with the dosage and frequency remaining the same since 1993. Their physician states that they are supportive of Brandon Schindele receiving an exemption.

Travis Stevens

Travis Stevens is a 33-year-old class 0 license holder in Michigan. They have a history of grand mal epilepsy and have been seizure free since August 2008. They take anti-seizure medication with the dosage and frequency remaining the same since August 2013. Their physician states that they are supportive of Travis Stevens receiving an exemption.

Brad Wetli

Brad Wetli is a 44-year-old class A CDL holder in Indiana. They have a history of seizure disorder and have been seizure free since 1997. They take anti-seizure medication with the dosage and frequency remaining the same since 1997. Their physician states that they are supportive of Brad Wetli receiving an exemption.

IV. Request for Comments

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315(b), FMCSA requests public comment from all interested persons on the exemption petitions described in this notice. We will consider all comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated under the **DATES** section of the notice.

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2023-19754 Filed 9-12-23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-EX-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Petition for Exemption From the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Nissan North America, Inc.

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

ACTION: Grant of petition for exemption.

SUMMARY: This document grants in full the Nissan North America, Inc.'s (Nissan) petition for exemption from the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard (theft prevention standard) for its Z vehicle line beginning in model year (MY) 2024. The petition is granted because the agency has determined that the antitheft device to be placed on the line as standard equipment 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. Nissan also requested confidential treatment for specific information in its petition. Therefore, no confidential information provided for purposes of this notice has been disclosed.

DATES: The exemption granted by this notice is effective beginning with the 2024 model year.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carlita Ballard, Office of International Policy, Fuel Economy, and Consumer Programs, NHTSA, West Building, W43-439, NRM-310, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. Ms. Ballard's phone number is (202) 366-5222. Her fax number is (202) 493-2990.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under 49 U.S.C. chapter 331, the Secretary of Transportation (and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) by delegation) is required to promulgate a theft prevention standard to provide for the identification of certain motor vehicles and their major replacement parts to impede motor vehicle theft. NHTSA promulgated regulations at 49 CFR part 541 (theft prevention standard) to require parts-marking for specified passenger motor vehicles and light trucks. Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 33106, manufacturers that are subject to the parts-marking requirements may petition the Secretary of Transportation for an exemption for a line of passenger motor vehicles equipped with an antitheft device as standard equipment that the Secretary decides is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements. In accordance

with this statute, NHTSA promulgated 49 CFR part 543, which establishes the process through which manufacturers may seek an exemption from the theft prevention standard.

49 CFR 543.5 provides general submission requirements for petitions and states that each manufacturer may petition NHTSA for an exemption of one vehicle line per model year. Among other requirements, manufacturers must identify whether the exemption is sought under section 543.6 or section 543.7. Under section 543.6, a manufacturer may request an exemption by providing specific information about the antitheft device, its capabilities, and the reasons the petitioner believes the device to be as effective at reducing and deterring theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements. Section 543.7 permits a manufacturer to request an exemption under a more streamlined process if the vehicle line is equipped with an antitheft device (an “immobilizer”) as standard equipment that complies with one of the standards specified in that section.¹

Section 543.8 establishes requirements for processing petitions for exemption from the theft prevention standard. As stated in section 543.8(a), NHTSA processes any complete exemption petition. If NHTSA receives an incomplete petition, NHTSA will notify the petitioner of the deficiencies. Once NHTSA receives a complete petition the agency will process it and, in accordance with section 543.8(b), will grant the petition 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.

Section 543.8(c) requires NHTSA to issue its decision either to grant or to deny an exemption petition not later than 120 days after the date on which

a complete petition is filed. If NHTSA does not make a decision within the 120-day period, the petition shall be deemed to be approved and the manufacturer shall be exempt from the standard for the line covered by the petition for the subsequent model year.² Exemptions granted under part 543 apply only to the vehicle line or lines that are subject to the grant and that are equipped with the antitheft device on which the line’s exemption was based, and are effective for the model year beginning after the model year in which NHTSA issues the notice of exemption, unless the notice of exemption specifies a later year.

Sections 543.8(f) and (g) apply to the manner in which NHTSA’s decisions on petitions are to be made known. Under section 543.8(f), if the petition is sought under section 543.6, NHTSA publishes a notice of its decision to grant or deny the exemption petition in the **Federal Register** and notifies the petitioner in writing. Under section 543.8(g), if the petition is sought under section 543.7, NHTSA notifies the petitioner in writing of the agency’s decision to grant or deny the exemption petition.

This grant of petition for exemption considers Nissan Motor North America, Inc.’s (Nissan) petition for its Z vehicle line beginning in MY 2024. Based on the information provided in Nissan’s petition, NHTSA has determined that the antitheft device to be placed on its vehicle line as standard equipment 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.

I. Specific Petition Content Requirements Under 49 CFR 543.6

Pursuant to 49 CFR part 543, *Exemption from Vehicle Theft Prevention*, Nissan petitioned for an exemption for its specified vehicle line from the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standard, beginning in MY 2024. Nissan petitioned under 49 CFR 543.6, *Petition: Specific content requirements*, which, as described above, requires manufacturers to provide specific information about the antitheft device installed as standard equipment on all vehicles in the line for which an exemption is sought, the antitheft device’s capabilities, and the reasons the petitioner believes the device to be as effective at reducing and deterring theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements.

More specifically, section 543.6(a)(1) requires petitions to include a statement

that an antitheft device will be installed as standard equipment on all vehicles in the line for which the exemption is sought. Under section 543.6(a)(2), each petition must list each component in the antitheft system, and include a diagram showing the location of each of those components within the vehicle. As required by section 543.6(a)(3), each petition must include an explanation of the means and process by which the device is activated and functions, including any aspect of the device designed to: (1) facilitate or encourage its activation by motorists; (2) attract attention to the efforts of an unauthorized person to enter or move a vehicle by means other than a key; (3) prevent defeating or circumventing the device by an unauthorized person attempting to enter a vehicle by means other than a key; (4) prevent the operation of a vehicle which an unauthorized person has entered using means other than a key; and (5) ensure the reliability and durability of the device.³

In addition to providing information about the antitheft device and its functionality, petitioners must also submit the reasons for their belief that the antitheft device will be effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft, including any theft data and other data that are available to the petitioner and form a basis for that belief,⁴ and the reasons for their belief that the agency should determine that the antitheft device is likely to be as effective as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of part 541 in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft. In support of this belief, the petitioners should include any statistical data that are available to the petitioner and form the basis for the petitioner’s belief that a line of passenger motor vehicles equipped with the antitheft device is likely to have a theft rate equal to or less than that of passenger motor vehicles of the same, or a similar, line which have parts marked in compliance with part 541.⁵

The following sections describe Nissan’s petition information provided pursuant to 49 CFR part 543, *Exemption from Vehicle Theft Prevention*. To the extent that specific information in Nissan’s petition is subject to a properly filed confidentiality request, that information was not disclosed as part of this notice.⁶

¹ 49 CFR 543.7 specifies that the manufacturer must include a statement that their entire vehicle line is equipped with an immobilizer that meets one of the following standards:

(1) The performance criteria (subsections 8 through 21) of C.R.C. c. 1038.114, *Theft Protection and Rollaway Prevention* (in effect March 30, 2011), as excerpted in appendix A of [part 543];

(2) National Standard of Canada CAN/ULC–S338–98, *Automobile Theft Deterrent Equipment and Systems: Electronic Immobilization* (May 1998);

(3) United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE) Regulation No. 97 (ECE R97), Uniform Provisions Concerning Approval of Vehicle Alarm System (VAS) and Motor Vehicles with Regard to Their Alarm System (AS) in effect August 8, 2007; or

(4) UN/ECE Regulation No. 116 (ECE R116), *Uniform Technical Prescriptions Concerning the Protection of Motor Vehicles Against Unauthorized Use* in effect on February 10, 2009.

² 49 U.S.C. 33106(d).

³ 49 CFR 543.6(a)(3).

⁴ 49 CFR 543.6(a)(4).

⁵ 49 CFR 543.6(a)(5).

⁶ 49 CFR 512.20(a).

II. Nissan's Petition for Exemption

In a petition dated November 17, 2022, Nissan requested an exemption from the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standard for the Z vehicle line beginning with MY 2024.

In its petition, Nissan provided a detailed description and diagram of the identity, design, and location of the components of the antitheft device for the Z vehicle line. Nissan stated that its MY 2024 Z vehicle line will be installed with a passive, electronic engine immobilizer device as standard equipment, as required by 543.6(a)(1). Key components of the antitheft device include an engine immobilizer, immobilizer control (CONT ASSY—SMART KEYLESS), engine control module (ECM), body control module, immobilizer antenna and a key FOB with a pre-registered key-ID microchip.

Pursuant to Section 543.6(a)(3), Nissan explained that activation of its immobilizer device occurs automatically when the ignition switch is turned to the "OFF" position. Nissan also stated that the immobilizer device prevents normal operation of the vehicle without using a special key. Nissan explained that when the brake SW or clutch is on and the key FOB is near the engine start switch, the BMC scans the Key-ID via the immobilizer ANT. The microchip then transmits the key-ID via radio wave. Next, the key-ID is received by the antenna and is amplified and transmitted to the BMC. Nissan further stated that the ECM will "request" the BCM to start the encrypted communication, and once the code is accepted, the BCM will send an OK-code and an encrypted code to the ECM. If the code is not accepted, the immobilizer control unit will send a NG-code. Nissan stated that the ECM will only stop the motor if it receives a NG-code from the BCM, the encrypted code is not correct, or no signal is received from the BCM.

As required in section 543.6(a)(3)(v), Nissan provided information on the reliability and durability of its proposed device. Nissan stated that its antitheft device is tested for specific parameters to ensure its reliability and durability. Nissan provided a detailed list of the tests conducted and believes that the device is reliable and durable since the device complied with its specified requirements for each test. Nissan stated that its immobilizer device satisfies the European Directive ECE R116, including tamper resistance. Nissan further stated that all control units for the device are located inside the vehicle, providing further protection from unauthorized accessibility of the device from outside

the vehicle. Nissan also stated that if a potential intruder were to damage the immobilizer system, it is designed so that the motor cannot be restarted and that the motor will restart only after transmission of the correct Key-ID and encrypted code are accepted. Nissan also stated that if an intruder were to substitute another immobilizer unit, the vehicle would still not be operable since the immobilizer and ECM are code-paired.

Nissan stated that 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). The agency notes that the theft rates for the Nissan Cube using an average of 3 MYs data (2012–2014), are 0.3322, 0.6471 and 2.0373 per thousand vehicles produced, respectively. For reference, the theft rate for MY 2014 passenger vehicles stolen in calendar year 2014 is 1.1512 thefts per thousand vehicles produced (82 FR 28246).

Nissan also 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 that 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 that theft rates for its Pathfinder vehicle line experienced reductions from model year (MY) 2000 to 2001 and subsequent years with implementation of an engine immobilizer device as standard equipment. Specifically, Nissan stated that the agency's theft rate data for MY's 2001 through 2005 reported theft rates of 1.9146, 1.8011, 1.1482, 0.8102, and 1.7298 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 that it believes that since its device is functionally equivalent to other comparable manufacturers' devices that have already 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.

III. Decision To Grant the Petition

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 33106 and 49 CFR 543.8(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, or deemed approved under 49 U.S.C. 33106(d). As discussed above, in this case, Nissan's petition is granted under 49 U.S.C. 33106(d).

This conclusion is based on the information Nissan provided about its antitheft device. NHTSA believes, based on Nissan's supporting evidence, the antitheft device described for its 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.

The agency concludes that Nissan's antitheft device will provide four of the five types of performance features listed in section 543.6(a)(3)⁷: 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. However, the agency wishes to note that the Z line will not provide any visible or audible indication of unauthorized vehicle entry (*i.e.*, flashing lights and horn alarm).

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 543.8(f) contains publication requirements incident to the disposition of all part 543 petitions. Advanced listing, including the release of future product nameplates, the

⁷ See, *e.g.*, 70 FR 74107 (Dec. 14, 2005). NHTSA has previously concluded that the lack of a visual or audio alarm has not prevented some antitheft devices from being effective protection against theft, where the theft data indicate a decline in theft rates for vehicle lines that have been equipped with devices similar to that what the petitioner is proposing to use.

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 its requested vehicle line, the manufacturer must formally notify the agency. If such a decision is made, the line must be fully marked as required by 49 CFR 541.5 and 541.6 (marking of major component parts and replacement parts).

NHTSA notes that if Nissan wishes in the future to modify the device on which the exemption is based, the company may have to submit a petition to modify the exemption. Section 543.8(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, section 543.10(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 the exemption."⁸

The agency wishes to minimize the administrative burden that section 543.10(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 that if Nissan 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 Z vehicle line from the parts-marking requirements of 49 CFR part 541, beginning with its MY 2024 vehicles.

⁸ The agency wishes to minimize the administrative burden that section 543.10(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 that if a manufacturer with an exemption 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.

Issued under authority delegated in 49 CFR 1.95 and 501.8.

Milton E. Cooper,

Acting Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 2023-19761 Filed 9-12-23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of the Comptroller of the Currency

[Docket ID OCC-OCC-2023-0014]

Mutual Savings Association Advisory Committee; Meeting

AGENCY: Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice of Federal Advisory Committee meeting.

SUMMARY: The OCC announces a meeting of the Mutual Savings Association Advisory Committee (MSAAC).

DATES: A public meeting of the MSAAC will be held on Tuesday, October 3, 2023, beginning at 8:30 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time (EDT). The meeting will be in person and virtual.

ADDRESSES: The OCC will host the October 3, 2023 meeting of the MSAAC at the OCC's offices at 400 7th Street SW, Washington, DC 20219 and virtually.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael R. Brickman, Deputy Comptroller for Specialty Supervision, (202) 649-5420, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Washington, DC 20219. If you are deaf, hard of hearing, or have a speech disability, please dial 7-1-1 to access telecommunications relay services. You also may access prior MSAAC meeting materials on the MSAAC page of the OCC's website.¹

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the authority of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (the Act), 5 U.S.C. 1001 *et seq.*, and the regulations implementing the Act at 41 CFR part 102-3, the OCC is announcing that the MSAAC will convene a meeting on Tuesday, October 3, 2023. The meeting is open to the public and will begin at 8:30 a.m. EDT. The purpose of the meeting is for the MSAAC to advise the OCC on regulatory or other changes the OCC may make to ensure the health and viability of mutual savings associations.

¹ <https://occ.gov/topics/supervision-and-examination/bank-management/mutual-savings-associations/mutual-savings-association-advisory-committee.html>.

The agenda includes a discussion of current topics of interest to the industry.

Members of the public may submit written statements to the MSAAC. The OCC must receive written statements no later than 5:00 p.m. EDT on Thursday, September 28, 2023. Members of the public may submit written statements to MSAAC@occ.treas.gov.

Members of the public who plan to attend the meeting should contact the OCC by 5:00 p.m. EDT on Thursday, September 28, 2023, to inform the OCC of their desire to attend the meeting and whether they will attend in person or virtually, and to obtain information about participating in the meeting. Members of the public may contact the OCC via email at MSAAC@OCC.treas.gov or by telephone at (202) 649-5420. Attendees should provide their full name, email address, and organization, if any. For persons who are deaf, hard of hearing, or have a speech disability, please dial 7-1-1 to arrange telecommunications relay services for this meeting.

Michael J. Hsu,

Acting Comptroller of the Currency.

[FR Doc. 2023-19732 Filed 9-12-23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Financial Crimes Enforcement Network

Privacy Act of 1974; System of Records

AGENCY: Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice of a new system of records.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, FinCEN is proposing to establish a new system of records titled Treasury/FinCEN .004 for information collected by FinCEN in connection with the implementation of the Corporate Transparency Act (CTA). The CTA requires certain entities to report to FinCEN identifying information associated with the entities themselves, their beneficial owners, and their company applicants (together, beneficial ownership information or BOI). The CTA also authorizes FinCEN to disclose BOI to authorized recipients, subject to strict protocols on security and confidentiality.

DATES: This action will be effective without further notice on October 13, 2023 unless it is modified in response to comments. Comments must be submitted by [the aforementioned date].