

- Red contrasting color on the air gauges indicating low air pressure

The functionality of both the parking brake system and the service brake system remains unaffected by using the ISO symbol for brake malfunction instead of “Brake Air” for the telltale in the subject vehicles.

4. NHTSA Precedents—Hino notes that NHTSA has previously granted petitions for decisions of inconsequential noncompliance for similar brake telltale issues:

(a) Docket No. NHTSA–2017–0011, 82 FR 33551 (July 20, 2017), grant of petition for Daimler Trucks North America, LLC.

(b) Docket No. NHTSA–2014–0046, 79 FR 78559 (December 30, 2014), grant of petition for Chrysler Group, LLC

(c) Docket No. NHTSA–2012–0004, 78 FR 69931 (November 21, 2013), grant of petition for Ford Motor Company.

In these instances, the vehicles displayed an ISO symbol for the brake telltale instead of the wording required under FMVSS No. 101. The ISO symbol in combination with other available warnings was deemed sufficient to provide the necessary driver warnings.

Hino 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.

To view Hino’s petition analyses in their entirety you can visit <https://www.regulations.gov> by following the online instructions for accessing the dockets and by using the docket ID number for this petition shown in the heading of this notice.

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 Hino 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 Hino 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,**  
Associate Administrator for Enforcement.  
[FR Doc. 2018–03678 Filed 2–21–18; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4910–59–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2014–0125; 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) 2015 GMC multipurpose passenger vehicles (MPV) do not fully comply with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 108, *Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment*. GM has filed a noncompliance report dated November 5, 2014. GM also petitioned NHTSA on November 26, 2014, for a decision that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mike Cole, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA, telephone (202) 366–5319, facsimile (202) 366–3081.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*I. Overview:* GM has determined that certain MY 2015 GMC MPVs do not fully comply with FMVSS No. 108, *Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment* (49 CFR 571.108). GM has filed a noncompliance report dated November 5, 2014, pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports. GM also petitioned NHTSA on November 26, 2014, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) and 49 CFR part 556, 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.

Notice of receipt of the petition was published with a 30-day public comment period, on June 11, 2015, in the **Federal Register** (80 FR 33334). No comments were received. To view the petition and all supporting documents log onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) website at:

<http://www.regulations.gov/>. Then follow the online search instructions to locate docket number “NHTSA–2014–0125.”

*II. Vehicles Involved:* Affected are approximately 51,616 MY 2015 GMC Yukon, Yukon Denali, Yukon XL, and Yukon XL Denali MPVs manufactured between September 19, 2013, and October 10, 2014. See GM’s petition for additional details.

*III. Noncompliance:* GM explains that the noncompliance is that under certain conditions the parking lamps on the subject vehicles fail to meet the device activation requirements of paragraph S7.8.5 of FMVSS No. 108.

*IV. Rule Requirements:* Paragraph S7.8.5 of FMVSS No. 108 titled “Activation,” as detailed in Table I–a, includes the requirements relevant to this petition:

- Parking lamps must be activated when the headlamps are activated in a steady burning state.

*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) GM explains that the condition is difficult to create even in laboratory settings, let alone real-world driving conditions. GM also stated that they were only able to duplicate the condition under the following circumstances:

- The vehicle is being operated during the daytime with the master lighting switch in “AUTO” mode.
- The transmission is not in “Park.”
- Three or more high-inrush current spikes that exceed the body control module (BCM) inrush current threshold occur on the parking lamp/daytime running lamp (DRL) circuit within a period of 0.625 seconds. While there may be other methods for triggering these spikes (e.g., a service event), GM has only been able to isolate one cause: manually moving the master lighting control from “AUTO” to parking lamp (or headlamp), back to “AUTO” and back to parking lamp (or headlamp) within 0.625 seconds.

(B) GM believes that drivers are unlikely to cause these spikes during real-world driving. The subject vehicles are equipped with automatic-headlamp operation, so there is very little need for drivers to ever manually operate their vehicle’s master lighting control. But even if a driver were inclined to do so, rapidly cycling a vehicle’s master lighting control from “AUTO” to parking lamp (or headlamp) back to “AUTO” and back to parking lamp (or headlamp) in less than a second is a highly unusual maneuver that few (if

any) drivers would ever attempt during normal vehicle operation.

(C) GM additionally explained that the condition is short-lived and that if the condition does occur any of the following routine operations will automatically correct the condition:

- The ignition is turned off and then on with the master lighting control in "AUTO" mode.
- Turning the ignition off with the master lighting control in any mode other than "AUTO," and then turning the ignition back on after a minimum of ten minutes.
- Cycling the master lighting control to off and then back to any on position.
- If the vehicle is in DRL mode, activating both turn signals, or shifting the transmission in and out of "PARK."

(D) GM notes that while the condition affects the parking lamps and DRLs it does not affect the operation of the vehicle's other lamps.

(E) GM also cited a previous petition that NHTSA granted dealing with a noncompliance that GM believes is similar to the noncompliance that is the subject of its petition.

GM is not aware of any field incidents or warranty claims relating to the subject noncompliance.

GM has additionally informed NHTSA that it corrected the noncompliance in subsequent production of the subject vehicles.

In summation, GM believes that the described noncompliance of the subject vehicles is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that its petition, seeking to exempt GM 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.

GM's complete petition and all supporting documents are available by logging onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) website at: <https://www.regulations.gov/> and following the online search instructions to locate the docket number listed in the title of this notice.

**NHTSA'S Decision:**

**NHTSA's Analysis:** NHTSA has reviewed and accepts GM's analyses that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

NHTSA stresses that compliant parking lamps are important safety features of vehicles. There are a number of factors that led NHTSA to the conclusion that under the specific circumstances described in this petition, this situation would have a low probability of occurrence and, if it should occur, it would neither be long lasting nor likely to occur during a

period when parking lamps are generally in use. Importantly, when the noncompliance does occur, other lamps remain functional. The combination of all of the factors, specific to this case, abate the risk to safety.

As defined by FMVSS No. 108, parking lamps are lamps on both the left and right of the vehicle which show to the front and are intended to mark the vehicle when parked or serve as a reserve front position indicating system in the event of headlamp failure. While this definition does not mention daytime or nighttime, NHTSA believes the primary benefit of parking lamps to motor vehicle safety occurs during dusk and darkness.

Based on GM's explanation, the condition during which the parking lamps do not activate simultaneously with the headlamps could only originate under a very narrow set of circumstances that cause the vehicle to falsely diagnose a short-to-ground of the parking lamp circuit. Furthermore, these narrow circumstances would only occur when the DRLs are activated which is during the daytime. For the condition to present itself during darkness, it would have had to originate during the day and continue operation past twilight, because that is when the headlamps and other required lamps (including parking lamps) are automatically activated. In addition, the condition would only exist until one of the actions that would reset the system and eliminate the condition occurred. GM explains the five conditions under which this occurs,<sup>1</sup> including actions like turning the vehicle off and then back on again while the lighting switch is in the default position.

Therefore, NHTSA concludes that there is a very remote chance that this situation would occur during dusk or darkness when parking lamps are important to safety and, importantly, that if the situation were to occur, it would correct itself during normal vehicle operations.

GM referred to two prior inconsequential noncompliance petitions NHTSA granted involving noncompliant conditions caused by a rare, or very specific and rare sequence of events. The first was a petition from

<sup>1</sup> Other reset conditions include: The ignition is turned off and then turned on with the master lighting control in "AUTO" mode; the ignition is turned off with the master lighting control in any mode other than "AUTO" and the vehicle is restarted after the ignition is off for a minimum of ten minutes; the master lighting control is turned off and then to any on position; the transmission is moved in and out of "Park" while the vehicle is in DRL mode (daytime and master lighting control is in "AUTO" position); or both turn signals are activated while the vehicle is in DRL mode.

Nissan North America (see 78 FR 59090), regarding a unique sequence of actions that can lead to the shift position indicator displaying the incorrect shift position. While this issue was considered a rare occurrence, the primary reason for granting the petition was that the vehicle could not be started or operated when the shift position indicator was in its noncompliant state. NHTSA does not believe that this prior petition supports GM's argument in this case since the relevant issue is that the vehicles under GM's current petition can be operated with the noncompliant condition.

The second was a petition from GM (see 78 FR 35355), regarding the occupant classification system telltale. In this case, GM explained, that on rare occasions (estimated as once every 18 months) during a particular ignition cycle, the passenger airbag telltale indicates that the airbag is "OFF," regardless of whether the airbag was or was not suppressed at the time. Despite the erroneous telltale, the airbag still functioned as designed and there was no danger to the vehicle occupants because of this noncompliance. Once again, NHTSA does not believe that this prior petition supports GM's argument in this case because the airbag was still fully functional and operating as designed.

**NHTSA's Decision:** In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA finds that GM has met its burden of persuasion that the subject FMVSS No. 108 noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, GM's petition is hereby granted and GM is consequently exempted from the obligation of providing notification of, and a free 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 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,**

*Associate Administrator for Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. 2018-03677 Filed 2-21-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## U.S.-CHINA ECONOMIC AND SECURITY REVIEW COMMISSION

### Notice of Open Public Hearing

**AGENCY:** U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of open public hearing.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given of the following hearing of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission.

The Commission is mandated by Congress to investigate, assess, and report to Congress annually on “the national security implications of the economic relationship between the United States and the People’s Republic of China.” Pursuant to this mandate, the Commission will hold a public hearing in Washington, DC on March 8, 2018 on “China, the United States, and Next Generation Connectivity.”

**DATES:** The hearing is scheduled for Thursday, March 8, 2018 from 9:00 a.m. to 2:50 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** TBD, Washington, DC. A detailed agenda for the hearing will be posted on the Commission’s website at [www.uscc.gov](http://www.uscc.gov). Also, please check the Commission’s website for possible changes to the hearing schedule. *Reservations are not required to attend the hearing.*

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Any member of the public seeking further information concerning the hearing should contact Leslie Tisdale, 444 North Capitol Street NW, Suite 602, Washington DC 20001; telephone: 202-624-1496, or via email at [ltisdale@uscc.gov](mailto:ltisdale@uscc.gov). *Reservations are not required to attend the hearing.*

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*Background:* This is the third public hearing the Commission will hold during its 2018 report cycle. This hearing will compare and contrast U.S. and Chinese pursuit of next generation connected devices and networks and the implications for U.S. economic competitiveness and national security. The hearing will focus on U.S. and Chinese 5th generation wireless technology (5G) and Internet of Things

standards and technology development, U.S. usage of Chinese Internet of Things technologies and 5G networks, and the ability of Chinese firms to collect and utilize data from U.S. consumers through Internet of Things technologies. The hearing will be co-chaired by Commissioner Michael Wessel and Commissioner Larry Wortzel. Any interested party may file a written statement by March 8, 2018, by mailing to the contact above. A portion of each panel will include a question and answer period between the Commissioners and the witnesses.

**Authority:** Congress created the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission in 2000 in the National Defense Authorization Act (Pub. L. 106-398), as amended by Division P of the Consolidated Appropriations Resolution, 2003 (Pub. L. 108-7), as amended by Public Law 109-108 (November 22, 2005), as amended by Public Law 113-291 (December 19, 2014).

Dated: February 16, 2018.

**Kathleen Wilson,**

*Finance and Operations Director, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2018-03621 Filed 2-21-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 1137-00-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

[OMB Control No. 2900-0068]

### Agency Information Collection Under OMB Review: Application for Service-Disabled Veterans Insurance

**AGENCY:** Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, this notice announces that the Veterans Benefits Administration (VBA), Department of Veterans Affairs, will submit the collection of information abstracted below to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The PRA submission describes the nature of the information collection and its expected cost and burden; it includes the actual data collection instrument.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before March 26, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit written comments on the collection of information through [www.Regulations.gov](http://www.Regulations.gov), or to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attn: VA Desk Officer; 725 17th St. NW, Washington, DC 20503 or send through electronic mail to [\[omb.eop.gov\]\(http://omb.eop.gov\). Please refer to “OMB Control No. 2900-0068” in any correspondence.](mailto:oir_submission@</a></p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Cynthia Harvey-Pryor, Enterprise Records Service (005R1B), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20420, (202) 461-5870 or email [cynthia.harvey-pryor@va.gov](mailto:cynthia.harvey-pryor@va.gov). Please refer to “OMB Control No. 2900-0068” in any correspondence.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

**Authority:** Pub. L. 104-13; 44 U.S.C. 3501-3521.

*Title:* Application for Service-Disabled Veterans Insurance, VA Form 29-4364 and VA Form 29-0151.

*OMB Control Number:* 2900-0068.

*Type of Review:* Reinstatement of a previously approved collection.

*Abstract:* These forms are used by veterans to apply for Service-Disabled Veterans Insurance, to designate a beneficiary and to select an optional settlement.

The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on this collection of information was published at 82 FR 229 on November 30, 2017, pages 56857-56858.

*Affected Public:* Individuals and Households.

*Estimated Annual Burden:* 8,333 hours.

*Estimated Average Burden per Respondent:* 20 minutes.

*Frequency of Response:* On occasion.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 25,000 respondents.

By direction of the Secretary.

**Cynthia Harvey-Pryor,**

*Department Clearance Officer, Office of Quality, Privacy and Risk, Department of Veterans Affairs.*

[FR Doc. 2018-03584 Filed 2-21-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8320-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

[OMB Control No. 2900-0695]

### Agency Information Collection Activity: Application for Reimbursement of Licensing or Certification Test Fees

**AGENCY:** Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Veterans Benefits Administration (VBA), Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), is announcing an