

Virginia Department of Transportation for the relocation of Virginia State Route 652. There are no impacts to the Airport and the land is not needed for airport development as shown on the Airport Layout Plan. The road is being relocated to provide more space for airport related development and the existing Route 652 right-of-way will be exchanged for the relocated road right-of-way.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before February 18, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Terry J. Page, Manager, FAA Washington Airports District Office, 23723 Air Freight Lane, Suite 210, Dulles, VA 20166.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Edwin P. Markowitz, Secretary-Treasurer Luray-Page County Airport Commission, at the following address: Mr. Edwin P. Markowitz, Secretary-Treasurer, Luray-Page County Airport Commission, 270 Circle View Road, Luray, Virginia 22835.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Terry Page, Manager, Washington Airports District Office, 23723 Air Freight Lane, Suite 210, Dulles, VA 20166; telephone (703) 661-1354, fax (703) 661-1370, email *Terry.Page@faa.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 5, 2000, new authorizing legislation became effective. That bill, the Wendell H. Ford Aviation investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century, Public Law 10-181 (Apr. 5, 2000; 114 Stat. 61) (AIR 21) requires that a 30-day public notice must be provided before the Secretary may waive any condition imposed on an interest in surplus property.

Issued in Chantilly, Virginia on January 6, 2003.

Terry J. Page,
Manager, Washington Airports District Office,
Eastern Region.

[FR Doc. 03-1121 Filed 1-16-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Intent To Rule on Application To Impose and Use the Revenue From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) at Arcata/Eureka Airport, Eureka, CA

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent to rule on application.

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC at Arcata/Eureka Airport under the provisions of the 49 United States Code (U.S.C.) section 40117 and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before February 18, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Federal Aviation Administration, Airports Division, 15000 Aviation Blvd., Room 3012, Lawndale, CA 90261, or San Francisco Airports District Office, 831 Mitten Road, Room 210, Burlingame, CA 94010-1303. In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Allen Campbell, Public Works Director, County of Humboldt, at the following address: 1106 Second Street, Eureka, CA 95501. Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the County of Humboldt under section 158.23 of part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marlys Vandervelde, Airports Program Analyst, San Francisco Airports District Office, 831 Mitten Road, Room 210, Burlingame, CA 94010-1303, Telephone: (650) 876-2806. The application may be reviewed in person at this same location.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC at Arcata/Eureka Airport under the provisions of the 49 United States Code (U.S.C.) section 40117 and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158). On December 20, 2002, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by the County of Humboldt was substantially complete within the requirements of section 158.25 of part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than March 22, 2003.

The following is a brief overview of the impose and use application number 03-05-C-00-ACV:

Level of proposed PFC: \$4.50.
Proposed charge effective date: June 1, 2003.
Proposed charge expiration date: July 1, 2003.
Total estimated PFC revenue approved in this application: \$93,000.

Brief description of the proposed project: Install Security/Perimeter Fence.

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: None.

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 Division located at: Federal Aviation Administration, Airports Division, 15000 Aviation Blvd., Room 3012, Lawndale, CA 90261. In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the County of Humboldt, Department of Public Works.

Issued in Hawthorne, California, on January 3, 2003.

Mia Paredes Ratcliff,

Acting Manager, Airports Division, Western-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 03-1131 Filed 1-16-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[FMCSA Docket No. FMCSA-2002-12844]

Qualification of Drivers; Exemption Applications; Vision

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

ACTION: Notice of final disposition.

SUMMARY: The FMCSA announces its decision to exempt 35 individuals from the vision requirement in the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs).

DATES: January 17, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information about the vision exemptions in this notice, you may contact Ms. Sandra Zywockarte, Office of Bus and Truck Standards and Operations, (202) 366-2987, 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

On November 12, 2002, the FMCSA published a Notice of its receipt of

applications from 35 individuals, and requested comments from the public (67 FR 68719). The 35 individuals petitioned the FMCSA for exemptions 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: Doris V. Adams, Thomas E. Adams, Rodger B. Anders, Thomas J. Boss, Jack W. Boulware, Mark L. Braun, Howard F. Breitzkreutz, Ryan J. Christensen, Kenneth E. Coplan, William T. Cummins, John E. Evenson, Leon Frieri, Wayne H. Holt, Steven C. Humke, Leon E. Jackson, Neil W. Jennings, Jimmy C. Killian, Craig M. Landry, Earl E. Louk, William R. Mayfield, Thomas E. Mobley, Richard E. Nordhausen, James P. Oliver, Jesse R. Parker, Tony E. Parks, Andrew H. Rusk, Henry A. Shelton, Richard L. Sheppard, Jayland R. Siebers, Deborah A. Sigle, David A. Stafford, Ronald A. Stevens, Kenneth E. Vigue, Jr., David G. Williams, and Richard A. Winslow.

Under 49 U.S.C. 31315 and 31136(e), the 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, the FMCSA has evaluated the 35 petitions on their merits and made a determination to grant the exemptions to all of them. The comment period closed on December 12, 2002. One comment was received, and its contents were carefully considered by the FMCSA in reaching the final decision to grant the petitions.

Vision And Driving Experience of the Applicants

The vision requirement in the FMCSRs 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)).

Beginning in 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 supported the FMCSA's (and previously the FHWA's) view that the present standard is reasonable and necessary as a general standard to ensure highway safety. The 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 35 applicants fall into this category. They are unable to meet the vision standard in one eye for various reasons, including amblyopia, retinal and macular scars, and loss of an eye due to trauma. In most cases, their eye conditions were not recently developed. All but 13 of the applicants were either born with their vision impairments or have had them since childhood. The 13 individuals who sustained their vision conditions as adults have had them for periods ranging from 4 to 60 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, *i.e.* the FMCSRs, however, require more.

While possessing a valid CDL or non-CDL, these 35 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 3 to 40 years. In the past 3 years, two of the drivers have had convictions for traffic violations. One of these convictions was for speeding, and

one was for "failure to secure load." One driver was involved in an accident but did not receive a citation.

The qualifications, experience, and medical condition of each applicant were stated and discussed in detail in the November 12, 2002, Notice. Since there were no docket comments on the specific merits or qualifications of any applicant, we have not repeated the individual profiles here. Our summary analysis of the applicants is supported by the information published at 67 FR 68719.

Basis for Exemption Determination

Under 49 U.S.C. 31315 and 31136(e), the 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 each of these drivers to drive in interstate commerce as opposed to restricting him or her to driving in intrastate commerce.

To evaluate the effect of these exemptions on safety, the 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, the 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 35 applicants receiving an exemption, we note that the applicants have had only one accident and two 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, the 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, the 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) to the 35 applicants listed in the November Notice.

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, the FMCSA will impose requirements on the 35 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

The FMCSA received one comment in this proceeding. The comment was considered and is discussed below.

Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety (Advocates) expresses continued opposition to the FMCSA’s policy to grant exemptions from the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations,

including the driver qualification standards. Specifically, Advocates: (1) Objects to the manner in which the 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 Advocates 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 comment to the docket and based upon its evaluation of the 35 exemption applications, the FMCSA exempts Doris V. Adams, Thomas E. Adams, Rodger B. Anders, Thomas J. Boss, Jack W. Boulware, Mark L. Braun, Howard F. Breitreutz, Ryan J. Christensen, Kenneth E. Coplan, William T. Cummins, John E. Evenson, Leon Frieri, Wayne H. Holt, Steven C. Humke, Leon E. Jackson, Neil W. Jennings, Jimmy C. Killian, Craig M. Landry, Earl E. Louk, William R. Mayfield, Thomas E. Mobley, Richard E. Nordhausen, James P. Oliver, Jesse R. Parker, Tony E. Parks, Andrew H. Rusk, Henry A. Shelton, Richard L. Sheppard, Jayland R. Siebers, Deborah A. Sigle, David A. Stafford, Ronald A. Stevens, Kenneth E. Vigue, Jr., David G. Williams, and Richard A. Winslow 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 the 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 the FMCSA for a renewal under procedures in effect at that time.

Issued on: January 13, 2003.

Brian M. McLaughlin,

Associate Administrator for Policy and Program Development.

[FR Doc. 03-1135 Filed 1-16-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-EX-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 34285]

Wisconsin & Southern Railroad Co.— Acquisition Exemption—Soo Line Railroad Company d/b/a Canadian Pacific Railway

Wisconsin & Southern Railroad Co. (WSOR), a Class III rail carrier, has filed a verified notice of exemption under 49 CFR 1150.41 to acquire from Soo Line Railroad Company d/b/a Canadian Pacific Railway approximately 32.5 miles of rail line known as the Waterloo Spur, extending between milepost 132.11 at Watertown, WI, and milepost 164.61 in Madison, WI. WSOR states that it has been leasing and operating the line since 1998,¹ and that the sole purpose of this transaction will merely be to convert its leasehold interest into an ownership interest, with no adverse effects on railroad employees.

WSOR certifies that its projected revenues as a result of this transaction will not result in the creation of a Class II or Class I rail carrier.

WSOR states that it expects to consummate the transaction shortly after January 1, 2003.²

¹ See *Wisconsin & Southern Railroad Co.—Lease and Operation Exemption—Soo Line Railroad Company d/b/a Canadian Pacific Railway*, STB Finance Docket No. 33571 (STB served May 27, 1998).

² Because WSOR's annual revenues exceed \$5 million, it filed a petition on November 26, 2002, requesting waiver of the Board's notice requirements at 49 CFR 1150.42(e). WSOR

If the notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio*. Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of a petition to revoke does not automatically stay the transaction.

An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to STB Finance Docket No. 34285, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board, 1925 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20423-0001. In addition, a copy of each pleading must be served on John D. Heffner, 555 12th Street, NW., Suite 950N, Washington, DC 20004.

Board decisions and notices are available on our Web site at <http://www.stb.dot.gov>.

Decided: January 13, 2003.

By the Board, David M. Konschnik,
Director, Office of Proceedings.

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-1137 Filed 1-16-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915-00-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 34294]

State of Vermont—Acquisition Exemption—Certain Assets of Newport and Richford Railroad Company, Northern Vermont Railroad Company Incorporated and Canadian American Railroad Company

The State of Vermont (Vermont) has filed a verified notice of exemption under 49 CFR 1150.41 to acquire from the Estates of Newport and Richford Railroad Company, Northern Vermont Railroad Company Incorporated and Canadian American Railroad Company (collectively, the Sellers),¹ the Sellers' rights, title and ownership interest in the right-of-way, trackage and other physical assets of a 61.58-mile rail line, extending between milepost 63.58 in

indicated there that it needed to consummate the acquisition no later than December 31, 2002, because the institution funding the acquisition had to close the transaction by the end of the 2002 calendar year. WSOR's request was granted by decision served December 20, 2002. However, by facsimile filed on January 8, 2003, WSOR now indicates that, due to a financing-related delay, it does not anticipate closing the transaction until some time in January or early February 2003.

¹ The Sellers are railroads in the Bangor and Aroostook Railroad Company (BAR) rail system. On August 15, 2001, an involuntary petition for bankruptcy under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Act was filed against BAR before the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Maine (Court). On May 14, 2002, the Sellers, filed voluntary petitions for relief under chapter 11 before the Court.

Newbury (Wells River) and milepost 2.0 in Newport, in Orange, Caledonia and Orleans Counties, VT (the Subject Line).² The Sellers will retain the rights and obligations to provide common carrier service on the line. In a separate transaction, the Sellers will convey the retained common carrier obligation and right to provide service to the Washington County Railroad Company (WCRC) through an exclusive operating easement.³

Consummation of the transaction was expected to occur on December 26, 2002 (7 days after the exemption was filed), but not before Montreal, Maine & Atlantic Railway, Ltd. has consummated its acquisition of certain other rail assets belonging to the BAR rail system in Vermont and Maine.⁴

If the notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio*. Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of a petition to revoke will not automatically stay the transaction.

An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to STB Finance Docket No. 34294, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board, 1925 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20423-0001. In addition, a copy of each pleading must be served on Edward J. Fishman, Kirkpatrick & Lockhart LLP, 1800 Massachusetts Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20036-1221.

Board decisions and notices are available on our website at <http://www.stb.dot.gov>.

Decided: January 13, 2003.

² Vermont simultaneously filed a motion to dismiss this notice of exemption. The motion will be handled in a separate decision.

³ WCRC has contemporaneously filed a notice of exemption in *Washington County Railroad Company—Acquisition and Operation—Certain Rights of Newport and Richford Railroad Company, Northern Vermont Railroad Company Incorporated and Canadian American Railroad Company*, STB Finance Docket No. 34302, to acquire an exclusive operating easement on the Subject Line.

⁴ In *Montreal, Maine & Atlantic Railway LLC—Acquisition and Operation Exemption—Bangor & Aroostook Railroad Company, Canadian American Railroad Company, the Northern Vermont Railroad Company Incorporated, Newport & Richford Railroad Company and Van Buren Bridge Company*, STB Finance Docket No. 34110 (STB served Sept. 19, 2002), Montreal, Maine & Atlantic Railway, LLC (MM&A—LLC) was authorized to acquire and operate, among other things, some 518 miles of BAR's rail lines and other assets in Maine and Vermont. These assets do not include the Subject Line. In a subsequent decision served on December 18, 2002, the Board granted a motion to substitute Montreal, Maine & Atlantic Railway, Ltd. as the party that may acquire and operate these assets in lieu of MM&A—LLC.