installation, airfield signage and lighting, relocation of Rotating Beacon, runway pavement rehabilitation and acquisition of land and construction of runway safety area.

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: Non-scheduled/on-demand air carriers filing Form 1800–31.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** and at the FAA regional Airports office located at: 1701 Columbia Avenue, College Park, Georgia 30337.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Jackson-Madison County Airport Authority, 308 Grady Montgomery Drive, Jackson, Tennessee 38301.

Issued in Memphis, Tennessee on April 11, 2002.

Charles L. Harris,

Assistant Manager, Memphis Airports District Office, Southern Region.

[FR Doc. 02–9852 Filed 4–22–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA–2001–11426]

Qualification of Drivers; Exemption Applications; Vision

AGENCY: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of final disposition.

SUMMARY: FMCSA announces its decision to exempt 36 individuals from the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10).

DATES: April 23, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information about the vision exemptions in this notice, Ms. Sandra Zywokarte, Office of Bus and Truck Standards and Operations, (202) 366–2987; for information about legal issues related to this notice, Mr. Joseph Solomey, Office of the Chief Counsel, (202) 366–1374, FMCSA, Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Office hours are from 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Access

You may see all the comments online through the Document Management System (DMS) at: *http://dmses.dot.gov.*

Background

Thirty-six individuals petitioned FMCSA for an exemption from the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10), which applies to drivers of commercial motor vehicles (CMVs) in interstate commerce. They are: Louis N. Adams, Guy M. Alloway, Lyle H. Banser, Paul R. Barron, Lloyd J. Botsford, Joseph E. Buck, Sr., Ronald M. Calvin, Rusbel P. Contreras, Timothy J. Droeger, Robert A. Fogg, Paul D. Gaither, David L. Grajiola, David L. Gregory, Walter D. Hague, Jr., Sammy K. Hines, Jeffrey J. Hoffman, Marshall L. Hood, Edward W. Hosier, Edmond L. Inge, Sr., James A. Johnson, Charles F. Koble, Robert W. Lantis, Lucio Leal, Terry W. Lytle, Earl R. Mark, James J. McCabe, Richard W. Neyens, Anthony G. Parrish, Bill L. Pearcy, Robert H. Rogers, Bobby C. Spencer, Mark J. Stevwing, Clarence C. Trump, Jr., Dennis R. Ward, Frankie A. Wilborn, and Jeffrey L. Wuollett.

Under 49 U.S.C. 31315 and 31136(e), FMCSA may grant an exemption for a 2-year period if it finds ''such exemption would likely achieve a level of safety that is equivalent to, or greater than, the level that would be achieved absent such exemption.'' The statute also allows the agency to renew exemptions at the end of the 2-year period. Accordingly, FMCSA has evaluated the 36 petitions on their merits and made a determination to grant the exemptions to all of them. On March 7, 2002, the agency published notice of its receipt of applications from these 36 individuals, and requested comments from the public (67 FR 10471). The comment period closed on April 8, 2002. Four comments were received, and their contents were carefully considered by FMCSA in reaching the final decision to grant the petitions.

Vision And Driving Experience of the Applicants

The vision requirement provides:

A person is physically qualified to drive a commercial motor vehicle if that person has distant visual acuity of at least 20/40 (Snellen) in each eye without corrective lenses or visual acuity separately corrected to 20/40 (Snellen) or better with corrective lenses, distant binocular acuity of at least 20/40 (Snellen) in both eyes with or without corrective lenses, field of vision of at least 70° in the horizontal meridian in each eye, and the ability to recognize the colors of traffic signals and devices showing standard red, green, and amber (49 CFR 391.41(b)(10).

Since 1992, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has undertaken studies to determine if this vision standard should be amended. The final report from our medical panel recommends changing the field of vision standard from 70° to 120°, while leaving the visual acuity standard unchanged. (See Frank C. Berson, M.D., Mark C. Kuperwaser, M.D., Lloyd Paul Aiello, M.D., and James W. Rosenberg, M.D., ''Visual Requirements and Commercial Drivers,'' October 16, 1998, filed in the docket, FHWA–98–4334.) The panel's conclusion supports FMCSA's (and previously the FHWA's) view that the present standard is reasonable and necessary as a general standard to ensure highway safety. FMCSA also recognizes that some drivers do not meet the vision standard, but have adapted their driving to accommodate their vision limitation and demonstrated their ability to drive safely.

The 36 applicants fall into this category. They are unable to meet the vision standard in one eye for various reasons, including amblyopia, macular scars, and loss of an eye due to trauma. In most cases, their eye conditions were not recently developed. All but nine of the applicants were either born with their vision impairments or have had them since childhood. The nine individuals who sustained their vision conditions as adults have had them for periods ranging from 6 to 42 years.

Although each applicant has one eye which does not meet the vision standard in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10), each has at least 20/40 corrected vision in the other eye and, in a doctor's opinion, has sufficient vision to perform all the tasks necessary to operate a CMV. The doctors' opinions are supported by the applicants' possession of valid commercial driver's licenses (CDLs) or non-CDLs to operate CMVs. Before issuing CDLs, States subject drivers to knowledge and performance tests designed to evaluate their qualifications to operate a CMV. All these applicants satisfied the testing standards for their State of residence. By meeting State licensing requirements, the applicants demonstrated their ability to operate a commercial vehicle, with their limited vision, to the satisfaction of the State. The Federal interstate qualification standards, however, require more.

While possessing a valid CDL or non-CDL, these 36 drivers have been authorized to drive a CMV in intrastate commerce, even though their vision disqualifies them from driving in

interstate commerce. They have driven CMVs with their limited vision for careers ranging from 6 to 56 years. In the past 3 years, the 36 drivers had 9 convictions for traffic violations among them. Seven of these convictions were for Speeding. The other convictions consisted of: ''Violation of Red Light Signal'' and ''Improper Turning.'' Two drivers were involved in an accident in a CMV, but did not receive a citation.

The qualifications, experience, and medical condition of each applicant were stated and discussed in detail in a March 7, 2002, notice (67 FR 10471). Since the docket comments did not focus on the specific merits or qualifications of any applicant, we have not repeated the individual profiles here. Our summary analysis of the applicants as a group is supported by the information published at 67 FR 10471.

Basis for Exemption Determination

Under 49 U.S.C. 31315 and 31136(e), FMCSA may grant an exemption from the vision standard in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10) if the exemption is likely to achieve an equivalent or greater level of safety than would be achieved without the exemption. Without the exemption, applicants will continue to be restricted to intrastate driving. With the exemption, applicants can drive in interstate commerce. Thus, our analysis focuses on whether an equal or greater level of safety is likely to be achieved by permitting these drivers to drive in interstate commerce as opposed to restricting them to driving in intrastate commerce.

To evaluate the effect of these exemptions on safety, FMCSA considered not only the medical reports about the applicants' vision, but also their driving records and experience with the vision deficiency. To qualify for an exemption from the vision standard, FMCSA requires a person to present verifiable evidence that he or she has driven a commercial vehicle safely with the vision deficiency for 3 years. Recent driving performance is especially important in evaluating future safety, according to several research studies designed to correlate past and future driving performance. Results of these studies support the principle that the best predictor of future performance by a driver is his/her past record of accidents and traffic violations. Copies of the studies have been added to the docket. (FHWA–98–3637)

We believe we can properly apply the principle to monocular drivers, because data from the vision waiver program clearly demonstrate the driving performance of experienced monocular drivers in the program is better than that of all CMV drivers collectively. (*See* 61 FR 13338, 13345, March 26, 1996.) The fact that experienced monocular drivers with good driving records in the waiver program demonstrated their ability to drive safely supports a conclusion that other monocular drivers, meeting the same qualifying conditions as those required by the waiver program, are also likely to have adapted to their vision deficiency and will continue to operate safely.

The first major research correlating past and future performance was done in England by Greenwood and Yule in 1920. Subsequent studies, building on that model, concluded that accident rates for the same individual exposed to certain risks for two different time periods vary only slightly. (*See* Bates and Neyman, University of California Publications in Statistics, April 1952.) Other studies demonstrated theories of predicting accident proneness from accident history coupled with other factors. These factors—such as age, sex, geographic location, mileage driven and conviction history—are used every day by insurance companies and motor vehicle bureaus to predict the probability of an individual experiencing future accidents. (*See* Weber, Donald C., ''Accident Rate Potential: An Application of Multiple Regression Analysis of a Poisson Process,'' Journal of American Statistical Association, June 1971.) A 1964 California Driver Record Study prepared by the California Department of Motor Vehicles concluded that the best overall accident predictor for both concurrent and nonconcurrent events is the number of single convictions. This study used 3 consecutive years of data, comparing the experiences of drivers in the first 2 years with their experiences in the final year.

Applying principles from these studies to the past 3-year record of the 36 applicants receiving an exemption, we note that cumulatively the applicants have had only two accidents and nine traffic violations in the last 3 years. The applicants achieved this record of safety while driving with their vision impairment, demonstrating the likelihood that they have adapted their driving skills to accommodate their condition. As the applicants' ample driving histories with their vision deficiencies are good predictors of future performance, FMCSA concludes their ability to drive safely can be projected into the future.

We believe the applicants' intrastate driving experience and history provide an adequate basis for predicting their ability to drive safely in interstate commerce. Intrastate driving, like interstate operations, involves substantial driving on highways on the interstate system and on other roads built to interstate standards. Moreover, driving in congested urban areas exposes the driver to more pedestrian and vehicular traffic than exists on interstate highways. Faster reaction to traffic and traffic signals is generally required because distances are more compact than on highways. These conditions tax visual capacity and driver response just as intensely as interstate driving conditions. The veteran drivers in this proceeding have operated CMVs safely under those conditions for at least 3 years, most for much longer. Their experience and driving records lead us to believe that each applicant is capable of operating in interstate commerce as safely as he or she has been performing in intrastate commerce. Consequently, FMCSA finds that exempting these applicants from the vision standard in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10) is likely to achieve a level of safety equal to that existing without the exemption. For this reason, the agency will grant the exemptions for the 2-year period allowed by 49 U.S.C. 31315 and 31136(e).

We recognize that the vision of an applicant may change and affect his/her ability to operate a commercial vehicle as safely as in the past. As a condition of the exemption, therefore, FMCSA will impose requirements on the 36 individuals consistent with the grandfathering provisions applied to drivers who participated in the agency's vision waiver program.

Those requirements are found at 49 CFR 391.64(b) and include the following: (1) That each individual be physically examined every year (a) by an ophthalmologist or optometrist who attests that the vision in the better eye continues to meet the standard in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10), and (b) by a medical examiner who attests that the individual is otherwise physically qualified under 49 CFR 391.41; (2) that each individual provide a copy of the ophthalmologist's or optometrist's report to the medical examiner at the time of the annual medical examination; and (3) that each individual provide a copy of the annual medical certification to the employer for retention in the driver's qualification file, or keep a copy in his/her driver's qualification file if he/she is self-employed. The driver must also have a copy of the certification when driving, for presentation to a duly authorized Federal, State, or local enforcement official.

Discussion of Comments

FMCSA received three comments in this proceeding. The comments were considered and are discussed below.

A letter was received from Babette E. Hosier, stating that drivers who have been driving in the past with visual impairment should be allowed to continue operating a CMV as long as their eye doctors report that they are capable of operating a CMV. FMCSA does not believe that vision exemptions should rest solely on the certification of an ophthalmologist or optometrist, for the reasons stated above under the heading ''Basis for Exemption Determination.''

Two individuals wrote in support of granting Mr. Hosier a vision exemption.

The Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety (AHAS) expresses continued opposition to FMCSA's policy to grant exemptions from the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations, including the driver qualification standards. Specifically, AHAS: (1) Objects to the manner in which FMCSA presents driver information to the public and makes safety determinations; (2) objects to the agency's reliance on conclusions drawn from the vision waiver program; (3) claims the agency has misinterpreted statutory language on the granting of exemptions (49 U.S.C. 31315 and 31136(e)); and finally (4) suggests that a recent Supreme Court decision affects the legal validity of vision exemptions.

The issues raised by AHAS were addressed at length in 64 FR 51568 (September 23, 1999), 64 FR 66962 (November 30, 1999), 64 FR 69586 (December 13, 1999), 65 FR 159 (January 3, 2000), 65 FR 57230 (September 21, 2000), and 66 FR 13825 (March 7, 2001). We will not address these points again here, but refer interested parties to those earlier discussions.

Conclusion

After considering the comments to the docket and based upon its evaluation of the 36 exemption applications in accordance with *Rauenhorst* v. *United States Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration,* 95 F.3d 715 (8th Cir. 1996), FMCSA exempts Louis N. Adams, Guy M. Alloway, Lyle H. Banser, Paul R. Barron, Lloyd J. Botsford, Joseph E. Buck, Sr., Ronald M. Calvin, Rusbel P. Contreras, Timothy J. Droeger, Robert A. Fogg, Paul D. Gaither, David L. Grajiola, David L. Gregory, Walter D. Hague, Jr., Sammy K. Hines, Jeffrey J. Hoffman, Marshall L. Hood, Edward W. Hosier, Edmond L. Inge, Sr., James A. Johnson, Charles F. Koble, Robert W. Lantis, Lucio Leal, Terry W. Lytle, Earl R. Mark, James J. McCabe, Richard W. Neyens, Anthony G. Parrish, Bill L. Pearcy, Robert H. Rogers, Bobby C. Spencer, Mark J. Stevwing, Clarence C. Trump, Jr., Dennis R. Ward, Frankie A. Wilborn, and Jeffrey L. Wuollett from the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10), subject to the following conditions: (1) That each individual be physically examined every year (a) by an ophthalmologist or optometrist who attests that the vision in the better eye continues to meet the standard in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10), and (b) by a medical examiner who attests that the individual is otherwise physically qualified under 49 CFR 391.41; (2) that each individual provide a copy of the ophthalmologist's or optometrist's report to the medical examiner at the time of the annual medical examination; and (3) that each individual provide a copy of the annual medical certification to the employer for retention in the driver's qualification file, or keep a copy in his/her driver's qualification file if he/she is self-employed. The driver must also have a copy of the certification when driving, so it may be presented to a duly authorized Federal, State, or local enforcement official.

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31315 and 31136(e), each exemption will be valid for 2 years unless revoked earlier by FMCSA. The exemption will be revoked if: (1) The person fails to comply with the terms and conditions of the exemption; (2) the exemption has resulted in a lower level of safety than was maintained before it was granted; or (3) continuation of the exemption would not be consistent with the goals and objectives of 49 U.S.C. 31315 and 31136. If the exemption is still effective at the end of the 2-year period, the person may apply to FMCSA for a renewal under procedures in effect at that time.

Issued on: April 18, 2002.

Brian M. McLaughlin,

Associate Administrator for Policy and Program Development.

[FR Doc. 02–9940 Filed 4–22–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[U.S. DOT Docket No. NHTSA–02–11585]

Reports, Forms, and Record Keeping Requirements

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

ACTION: Request for public comment on proposed collection of information.

SUMMARY: Before a Federal agency can collect certain information from the public, it must receive approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Under new procedures established by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before seeking OMB approval, Federal agencies must solicit public comment on proposed collections of information, including extensions and reinstatements of previously approved collections.

This document describes one collection of information for which NHTSA intends to seek OMB approval.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 24, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to U.S. Department of Transportation Dockets, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Plaza 401, Washington, DC 20590. Docket No. NHTSA–02–11585.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Alan Block, Contracting Officer's Technical Representative, Office of Research and Traffic Records (NTS–31), National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Room 6240, Washington, DC 20590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before an agency submits a proposed collection of information to OMB for approval, it must publish a document in the **Federal Register** providing a 60-day comment period and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information. The OMB has promulgated regulations describing what must be included in such a document. Under OMB's regulations (at 5 CFR 1320.8(d)), an agency must ask for public comment on the following:

(i) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(ii) The accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(iii) How to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(iv) How to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.*, permitting electronic submission of responses.

In compliance with these requirements, NHTSA asks public