would like a copy of your material distributed to each member of the committee or subcommittee in advance of a meeting, please submit 25 copies to the Executive Director no later than April 6, 2001.

Information on Services for Individuals With Disabilities

For information on facilities or services for individuals with disabilities or to request special assistance at the meetings, contact the Executive Director as soon as possible.

Dated: March 19, 2001.

Kenneth T. Venuto,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Director of Operations Policy.

[FR Doc. 01–7318 Filed 3–22–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Public Notice for Waiver of Aeronautical Land-Use Assurance General Mitchell International Airport, Milwaukee, WI

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent of waiver with respect to land.

SUMMARY: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is giving notice that a portion of the airport property containing 2.12 acres located in the south edge of the airport along Rawson Ave is not needed for aeronautical use as currently identified on the Airport Layout Plan.

This parcel was originally acquired through Grant No. FAAP–9–42–032–5912 in 1959. The parcel is presently open and undeveloped. The land comprising this parcel is, therefore, no longer needed for aeronautical purposes. The airport wishes to transfer ownership of the land to facilitate future noise compatible development in the vicinity of the airport. Income from the sale will be used to improve the airport. There are no impacts to the airport by allowing the airport to dispose of the property.

In accordance with section 47107(h) of title 49, United States Code, this notice is required to be published in the **Federal Register** 30 days before modifying the land-use assurance that requires the property to be used for an aeronautical purpose.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 23, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Sandra E. DePottey, Program Manager, Federal Aviation Administration, Airports District Office, 6020 28th Avenue South, Room 102, Minneapolis, MN 55450–2706. Telephone Number (612) 713–4363/FAX Number (612) 713–4364. Documents reflecting this FAA action may be reviewed at this same location or at the General Mitchell International Airport, Milwaukee, WI.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice announces that the FAA intends to authorize the disposal of the subject airport property at General Mitchell International Airport, Milwaukee, WI. Approval does not constitute a commitment by the FAA to financially assist in the disposal of the subject airport property nor a determination that all measures covered by the program are eligible for Airport Improvement Program funding from the FAA. The disposition of proceeds from the disposal of the airport property will be in accordance with FAA's Policy and Procedures Concerning the Use of Airport Revenue, published in the **Federal Register** on February 16, 1999.

Issued in Minneapolis, MN on March 2, 2001.

Nancy M. Nistler,

Manager, Minneapolis Airports District Office, FAA, Great Lake Region.

[FR Doc. 01–7275 Filed 3–22–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Intelligent Transportation Society of America; Public Meeting

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Intelligent Transportation Society of America (ITS AMERICA) will hold a meeting of its Coordinating Council on Tuesday, April 17, 2001. The meeting begins at 8 am. The letter designations that follow each item mean the following: (I) Is an information item; (A) is an action item; (D) is a discussion item. The General Session includes the following items: (1) Housekeeping items—introductions, antitrust, previous minutes, etc.; (2) Federal Report (I/D); (3) President's Report (I/D); (4) Council Membership Issues Discussion, SAE & APTA Ex-Officio with Voting Rights designation (D/A); (5) Annual Meeting 2001 Update (I/D); (6) 511 Update (I/D); (7) Break (20 minutes); (8) Joint Task Force on Deployment Strategy (I/D/A); (9) Weather Information Applications Task Force, Position Paper on Environmental Information in the ITS Architecture (D/A); (10) Data Security & Privacy Task Force, Standards & Protocol Committee (I/D); (11) APTS Committee Report, Bus & Paratransit Research Program Advice (D/A); (12) IVI Advice Letter (D/A); (13) Closing Housekeeping—next meeting dates/locations, adjourn.

ITS AMERICA provides a forum for national discussion and recommendations on ITS activities including programs, research needs, strategic planning, standards, international liaison, and priorities.

The charter for the utilization of ITS AMERICA establishes this organization as an advisory committee under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) 5 U.S.C. app. 2, when it provides advice or recommendations to DOT officials on ITS policies and programs. (56 FR 9400, March 6, 1991).

DATES: The Coordinating Council of ITS AMERICA will meet on Tuesday, April 17, 2001, from 8 a.m.–noon.

ADDRESSES: Hilton Crystal City at National Airport, 2399 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202; Phone: (703) 418–6800; Fax: (703) 418–3763.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Materials associated with this meeting may be examined at the offices of ITS AMERICA, 400 Virginia Avenue SW., Suite 800, Washington, DC 20024. Persons needing further information or who request to speak at this meeting should contact Debbie M. Busch at ITS AMERICA by telephone at (202) 484–2904 or by FAX at (202) 484–3483. The DOT contact is Kristy Frizzell, FHWA, HOIT, Washington, DC 20590, (202) 366–9536. Office hours are from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except for legal holidays.

Authority: 23 U.S.C. 315; 49 CFR 1.48.

Issued on: March 20, 2001.

Jeffrey Paniati,

ITS Program Manager, ITS Joint Program Office.

[FR Doc. 01–7268 Filed 3–22–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA–2001–8398]

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 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10).

DATES: March 23, 2001.

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. Joe 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-five individuals petitioned the FMCSA for an exemption of the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10), which applies to drivers of commercial motor vehicles (CMVs) in interstate commerce. They are: Carl W. Adams, David F. Bardsley, William E. Beckley, Joseph M. Blankenship, Willie Burnett, Awilda S. Colon, Robert P. Conrad, Jerald O. Edwards, William W. Ferrell, Marion R. Fox, Jr., Thomas E. Howard, James L. Johnson, Spencer E. Leonard, John K. Love, Robert C. Lueders, Thomas F. Marczewski, Samson B. Margison, Velmer L. McClelland, Duane A. McCord, Gene L. Miller, John E. Musick, Bobby G. Pool, Sr., Robert Radcliff, Jr., Randolph M. Riffey, Billy G. Saunders, George D. Schell, Gerald L. Smith, Scottie Stewart, Clarence L. Swann, Jr., Robert Tatum, Thaddeus E. Temoney, Roberto R. Turpaud, Roy B. Waggoner, Harry C. Weber, and Yu Weng.

Under 49 U.S.C. 31315 and 31136(e), the FMCSA may grant an exemption for a renewable 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.'' Accordingly, the FMCSA has evaluated the 35 petitions on their merits and made a determination to grant the exemptions to all of them. On December 14, 2000, the agency published notice of its receipt of applications from these 35 individuals, and requested comments from the public (65 FR 78256). The comment period closed on January 16, 2001. Two comments were received, and their 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 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 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, corneal and macular scars, and loss of an eye due to trauma. In most cases, their eye conditions were not recently developed. All but 26 of the applicants were either born with their vision impairments or have had them since childhood. The 9 individuals who sustained their vision conditions as adults have had them for periods ranging from 4 to 51 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 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 4 to 45 years. In the past 3 years, the 35 drivers had 11 convictions for traffic violations among them. Seven of these convictions were for speeding. The other convictions consisted of: ''Driver Failure to Obey All Trucks Stop at Scales''; ''Failure to Stop''; ''Failure to Obey Stop Sign''; and ''Failure to [Use Chains] When Required.'' One driver was 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 December 14, 2000, notice (65 FR 78256). 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 65 FR 78256.

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 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, 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 cumulatively the applicants have had only one accident and 11 traffic violations in the last 3 years. That single accident did not result in the issuance of a citation against the applicant. 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).

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 two comments in this proceeding. The comments were considered and are discussed below.

James L. Johnson, one of the applicants under consideration, wrote encouraging the FMCSA to approve his application for an exemption.

Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety (AHAS) expresses continued opposition to the FMCSA's policy to grant exemptions from the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs), including the driver qualification standards. Specifically, the AHAS: (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 the 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.

Notwithstanding the FMCSA's ongoing review of the vision standard, as evidenced by the medical panel's report dated October 16, 1998, and filed in this docket, the FMCSA must comply with *Rauenhorst* v. *United States Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration*, 95 F.3d 715 (8th Cir. 1996), and grant individual exemptions under standards that are consistent with public safety. Meeting those standards, the 35 veteran drivers

in this case have demonstrated to our satisfaction that they can continue to operate a CMV with their current vision safely in interstate commerce, because they have demonstrated their ability in intrastate commerce. Accordingly, they qualify for an exemption under 49 U.S.C. 31315 and 31136(e).

Conclusion

After considering the comments to the docket and based upon its evaluation of the 35 exemption applications in accordance with the *Rauenhorst* decision, the FMCSA exempts Carl W. Adams, David F. Bardsley, William E. Beckley, Joseph M. Blankenship, Willie Burnett, Awilda S. Colon, Robert P. Conrad, Jerald O. Edwards, William W. Ferrell, Marion R. Fox, Jr., Thomas E. Howard, James L. Johnson, Spencer E. Leonard, John K. Love, Robert C. Lueders, Thomas F. Marczewski, Samson B. Margison, Velmer L. McClelland, Duane A. McCord, Gene L. Miller, John E. Musick, Bobby G. Pool, Sr., Robert Radcliff, Jr., Randolph M. Riffey, Billy G. Saunders, George D. Schell, Gerald L. Smith, Scottie Stewart, Clarence L. Swann, Jr., Robert Tatum, Thaddeus E. Temoney, Roberto R. Turpaud, Roy B. Waggoner, Harry C. Weber, and Yu Weng 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.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 322, 31315 and 31136; 49 CFR 1.73.

Issued on: March 16, 2001.

Stephen E. Barber,

Acting Deputy Administrator, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

[FR Doc. 01–7279 Filed 3–22–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Ex Parte No. 290 (Sub No. 5) (2001–2)]

Quarterly Rail Cost Adjustment Factor

AGENCY: Surface Transportation Board.

ACTION: Approval of rail cost adjustment factor.

SUMMARY: The Board has approved the second quarter 2001 rail cost adjustment factor (RCAF) and cost index filed by the Association of American Railroads. The second quarter 2001 RCAF (Unadjusted) is 1.076. The second quarter 2001 RCAF (Adjusted) is 0.588. The second quarter 2001 RCAF–5 is 0.565.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 1, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: H. Jeff Warren, (202) 565–1533. Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) for the hearing impaired: 1–800–877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Additional information is contained in the Board's decision. To purchase a copy of the full decision, write to, call, or pick up in person from: DA•TO•DA OFFICE SOLUTIONS, Suite 405, 1925 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20423–0001, telephone (202) 466–5530. (Assistance for the hearing impaired is available through FIRS: 1–800–877–8339.)

This action will not significantly affect either the quality of the human environment or energy conservation.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 605(b), we conclude that our action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

Decided: March 19, 2001.

By the Board, Chairman Morgan, Vice Chairman Clyburn, and Commissioner Burkes.

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01–7270 Filed 3–22–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915–00–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

March 16, 2001.

The Department of the Treasury has submitted the following public information collection requirement(s) to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling the Treasury Bureau Clearance Officer listed. Comments regarding this information collection should be addressed to the OMB reviewer listed and to the Treasury Department Clearance Officer, Department of the Treasury, Room 2110, 1425 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20220.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before April 23, 2001 to be assured of consideration.

Financial Management Service (FMS)

OMB Number: 1510–0012.

Form Number: FMS Form 6314.

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: Annual Financial Statements of Surety Companies—Schedule F

Description: The information is obtained from Surety and Insurance Companies. It is used to compute the amount of unauthorized reinsurance in determining Treasury Certified Companies' underwriting limitations which are published in Treasury Circular 570 for use by Federal bond approving officers.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 368.

Estimated Burden Hours Per Respondent: 48 hours, 45 minutes.

Frequency of Response: Annually.

Estimated Total Reporting Burden: 15,635 hours.

Clearance Officer: Juanita Holder, Financial Management Service 3700 East West Highway, Room 144, PGP II, Hyattsville, MD 20782,

OMB Reviewer: Alexander T. Hunt, (202) 395–7860, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10202, New