Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC)
Transport Airplane and Engine (TAE) Issues Area

Meeting Minutes

Date: April 17, 2007 (ad hoc)
Time: 11:00 a.m. EDT
Location: Washington, DC

Call to Order/Administrative Reporting

Mr. Craig Bolt (Assistant Chair) called the meeting (teleconference) to order at 11:00 a.m. Mr. Mike Kaszycki (Assistant Executive Director) read the Federal Advisory Committee Act statement. Mr. Bolt began the introductions.

Craig Bolt	Assistant Chair	Keith Barnett	Bombardier
Mike Kaszycki	Assistant Executive Director	Walter Desrosier	GAMA
Doug Kihm	Boeing	Tom Peters	Embraer
Amos Hoggard	Boeing	Rolf Greiner	Airbus
Suzanne Masterson	FAA	Walt Sippel	FAA
Nic Davidson	FAA		

Mr. Hoggard began a discussion of the Airworthiness Assurance Working Group (AAWG) report **[handout #1] of the Phase 1, Task 3 Work Product.** Mr. Hoggard stated that this report concerned the tasking statement issued in 2004 in which ARAC was asked to provide recommendations on how to incorporate repairs and alterations with respect to previous recommendations that had been made in another ARAC tasking. He stated that the AAWG had submitted a written report to ARAC in 2005 which had recommended a previous course of action and the development of an Advisory Circular that would facilitate that process.

He stated that an NPRM had been published in April 2006, and that after the comment period had closed, it was thought by the AAWG that the FAA was possibly considering some scope changes to the rule. He further stated that there had been some concern as to whether or not the FAA wanted the AAWG to continue its work on the tasking, to which the response had been yes.

Mr. Hoggard said that even though baseline structure was not part of the original tasking, the FAA was very interested in the work being produced by the AAWG. He stated that the report on which the TAEIG was to vote during today's meeting was the written report concerning repairs and alterations. Mr. Hoggard stated that the AAWG had determined that it needed to conceptualize what a WFD Final Rule would look like, and that view was presented on page five (slide 5) in this briefing to the TAEIG.

Mr. Hoggard stated that with respect to the WFD NPRM, industry had "heavily" commented that there was no perceived need to produce an Airworthiness Directive (AD) to cover maintenance service actions to preclude WFD. However, he said, it had been determined that there existed a basic legal requirement by the FAA to do so.

With respect to Repairs and Modifications (RAMS), Mr. Hoggard stated that it is believed also by the AAWG in general, that industry desires to see a rule relating to baseline structure, and possibly also a rule on repairs and alterations. He further stated it was felt by the group that this was more important than the Aging Aircraft Safety Final Rule (AASFR). He said that the AAWG is ready to assist the FAA in aligning the Advisory material with final rule recommendations.

In reference to his discussion on harmonization with EASA (slide14), Mr. Hoggard said that it was recently learned that EASA is likely to seek harmonization with the FAA regarding the issues discussed in this briefing to the TAEIG. With respect to the recommended methodology for third party evaluation of repairs and alterations, Mr. Hoggard stated that though the methodology is simplified, it is also very conservative. He further stated that it would result in an unnecessarily burdensome inspection process for determining airworthiness. Mr. Hoggard emphasized that the exclusion from WFD of aircraft certified prior to 1958 had been included in the original NPRM from April 2006. This he said, was because there was insufficient data available to support, a successful assessment on these airplane and that the data had never been developed.

Mr. Hoggard stated that there was much misconception as to how the calculation of Limit of Validity (LOV) relative to the Design Service Goal (DSG) of the high-time airplane is determined. He said that a detailed process for that calculation is provided in an appendix included in the AC. He emphasized that the LOV extension process needs to be implemented a minimum of four years before actual LOV is reached to preclude grounding of a specific aircraft.

In a discussion with Mr. Barnett and Mr. Derossier, Mr. Hoggard clarified that paragraph 3 on slide # 20 (Baseline Structure), was meant to convey the inclusion of the aircraft mentioned in that paragraph "in addition to" all other criteria. Mr. Sippel confirmed to Mr. Hoggard that the explanation was correct.

Mr. Derossier then opened a discussion regarding the apparent ambiguity in determining DSG. He stated that he felt there would be numerous questions from customers relative to that process. He asked if future airplanes would come with a predetermined and published DSG. Mr. Hoggard stated that he understood the current Amendment 96 to require the publishing of the DSG. Mr. Sippel and Mr. Kaszycki added that Amendment 96 did not require that the DSG be published in a publicly available type document. Mr. Derossier agreed the he did not think the requirement existed to publish a DSG, but he understood that it needed to be available during the certification process.

Mr. Derossier expressed that whenever the WFD regulatory requirements become effective, the operators must be clear on how and when the determination of DSG is made so they can remain in compliance.

Mr. Sippel stated that the WFD NPRM is proposing that LOV be published in the Aircraft Limitations Section (ALS), which would make it publicly available. He also responded to a question from Mr. Barnett, by stating that the DSG would be defined by each manufacturer. Mr. Sippel used Boeing as an example of one manufacturer that has apparently published that determination process for some of its airplanes. He said that the process now needs to be incorporated into rulemaking. Mr. Hoggard also cited some specific Boeing products such as the 757 & 767 that present information for determining DSG through the use of "curves," which through the interpretative process; provide the necessary information to operators. Mr. Derossier and Mr. Barnett expressed that they expect a significant number of comments on the DSG determination process when the document is published for comments.

Regarding recommendations on "Baseline Structure" (Slide 21), Mr. Greiner asked Mr. Hoggard why the three and half year point was chosen to commence action on an airplane that was within 5 years of reaching DSG. Mr. Hoggard explained that 75% was originally chosen to represent that an airplane was five years from reaching its DSG. He stated that one year needed to be subtracted to allow the operator to implement "the program" and another half year was needed for the FAA to review and approve all data. This he said necessitated a three and a half year lead time for all work to be accomplished.

In response to another question from Mr. Greiner, Mr. Hoggard acknowledged that "high-time" airplanes that have exceed the DSG (Slide 21) referred to those airplanes that will have exceeded the regulatory DSG before the effective date of the WFD rule.

Mr. Kaszycki asked Mr. Hoggard if the air carrier representatives on the AAWG were "okay" with the one and a half years given for the implementation and approval process relative to LOV determination. Mr. Hoggard responded that they were, and clarified that the one and a half years only represented the allotted time for inclusion of LOV into the specific carriers' maintenance plan and did not address service actions.

With respect to the conclusions presented on "Repairs" (Slide 21, Mr. Hoggard emphasized that the AAWG's recommendations were specific to "properly installed" repairs. He also pointed out that for economic reasons, the AAWG recommended that required updates to publications for DT and WFD (paragraph 1) should occur simultaneously.
In responding to a question from Mr. Barnett, Mr. Hoggard stated that the "special types" referred to on Slide 25 in paragraph (b), were addressed in the AAWG report, which was provided with this presentation.

Mr. Hoggard concluded his presentation, and turned the meeting back over to Mr. Bolt.

Mr. Bolt stated that an email had been received from Mr. Dave Lotterer who had indicated that he would not be able to participate in the TAEIG meeting, but that his organization was in support of the Phase 1, Task 3 Report.

Mr. Barnett asked a question regarding the applicability of DSG and LOV and different aircraft weights. In attempting to clarify Mr. Barnetts' question Mr. Kaszycki queried Mr. Sippel as to the existence of an apparent gap in applicability for those airplanes weighing more that 75,000 pounds and those less than 75,000 pounds, and if in fact that gap was intentional.

Mr. Sippel responded by explaining that the original work regarding WFD was centered about airplanes weighing 75,000 and greater. He further stated said that it was determined to be a suitable starting point at that time, and rulemaking to address those heavier airplanes would continue, and further stated that rulemaking to address the lighter airplanes would be undertaken at a point in the future. Mr. Sippel agreed with Mr. Kaszycki, that this action was in fact based on a risk management approach. Mr. Kaszycki further clarified (with concurrence from Mr. Sippel) however, that in the short term the DSG for some airplanes weighing less than 75000 would still be addressed, and that future rulemaking would be necessary to address WFD and LOV.

Mr. Kaszycki stated that he had received indications that EASA was looking to the FAA for leadership in this area, and would seek alignment with the FAA with respect to the rulemaking efforts being pursued relative to WFD.

Mr. Derossier asked if new part 25 business airplanes (less than 75,000 pounds/fewer than 30 seats) would have WFD and DSG requirements. Mr. Sippel stated that any post Amendment-96 transport type airplanes, regardless of weight, is subject to WFD requirements and that the WFD NPRM is proposing that airplane should also be have an LOV.

Mr. Derossier also pointed out that currently only part 121 and part 129 operators are subject to LOV requirements, and wondered how that process would apply to operators under different FAR parts. Mr. Sippel stated that that bridge is accomplished under the general applicability in part 91 for ALS information.

Mr. Kihm raised the question as to why EASA was not represented at this ARAC TAEIG meeting. Mr. Kihm stated that in light of the concerns in industry, EASA participation at least through teleconference would be "reasonable." Mr. Kaszycki stated that he would be traveling in the near future to meet with EASA representatives, and he would bring the subject up at that time.

Mr. Bolt then asked for a vote on the Phase 1, Task 3 Report as presented for submission to the FAA. Representatives from the following agencies voted in favor of submitting the report; Boeing, Bombardier, Embraer, Airbus, and GAMA. There was no dissent. Mr. Bolt stated that approved report would be submitted to the FAA. He said there was no other business for this meeting of the TAEIG.

Adjourned at 11:58 a.m.

Public Notification

The *Federal Register* published a notice **[handout 2]** of this meeting on April 2, 2007.

Approval

I certify the minutes are accurate.

Craig R. Bolt
Assistant Chair, ARAC

AAWG Phase 1, Task 3 Work Product

Report to TAEIG

April 17, 2007

The Tasking Statement

- *Task 3.—Widespread Fatigue Damage (WFD) of Repairs, Alterations, and Modifications*
  - Provide a written report providing recommendations on how best to enable part 121 and 129 certificate holders of airplanes with a maximum gross take-off weight of greater than 75,000 pounds to assess the WFD characteristics of structural repairs, alterations, and modifications as recommended in a previous ARAC tasking. The written report will include a proposed action plan to address and/or accomplish these recommendations including actions that should be addressed in task 4 below. The report is to be submitted to the ARAC, Transport Airplane and Engine Issues Group, for approval. The ARAC, Transport Airplane and Engine Issues Group, will determine as appropriate the means by which the action plan will be implemented. The proposed actions and implementation process approved by the ARAC, Transport Airplane and Engine Issues Group, will be subject to FAA concurrence.

FAA ARAC Tasking

- Following extensive Industry comments to the FAA WFD NPRM, the FAA continued to desire the completion of the ARAC tasking to provide credible information to support rulemaking.
- In support of the rulemaking, the FAA expressed interested in the AAWG technical position on baseline structure and RAMs, the former being beyond the scope of the original tasking.

AAWG Action

- We complied with the ARAC Tasking and the subsequent FAA direction.
  - We established that in order to fully understand the approach for repairs and alterations, we needed to understand the how WFD was to be handled for Baseline Structure. We reviewed AC 120-YY and proposed an alternative that better fits the FAA and Industry position.
  - We provided technical positions on a number of issues requested by the FAA dealing with repairs and alterations.
  - We provided a written report and data to support our positions.

The Assumed WFD Paradigm

- The AAWG, discussed various scenarios with the FAA to develop a view of the final WFD rule, considering Industry Comments. That view is summarized below:
  - A Final Rule will be issued since there is a shared technical concern that WFD will occur in the commercial fleet and could potentially affect any airplane in service, even though there have been no WFD attributed accidents in the last nineteen years.
  - The rule will require the development of an Limit of Validity and Service Actions necessary to maintain airworthiness.
  - The FAA is reconsidering when the LOV needs to be established and may only require the development of an LOV when the high-time “fleet” airplane reaches DSG. For high-time airplanes near, at, or exceeding DSG on the rule effective date, the LOV would need to be determined within a specified time.
  - The final rule will not include any consideration for existing repairs and alterations. The rule will be supplemented at a later time, if necessary.

Concerning the Baseline Structure

- The final rule being considering may be limited to prevention of WFD in the baseline structure alone, since this is the only structure that has demonstrated development of WFD in-service.
- Because of due process considerations, any maintenance actions required to preclude WFD in the baseline structure up to the LOV will need to be mandated by AD.

Concerning RAMs

- **Future Action On RAMs a Possibility**
  - Any future action on RAMs will be dependant on the publication of a rule for baseline structure and the development of acceptable standards for third parties.
  - The FAA has requested the AAWG provide information that would be used to support future WFD rulemaking for repairs and alterations, should the FAA decide that repairs and alterations require such rules - ***Encompasses Task 3 Requirements***

AAWG Recommendations

- The AAWG Recommendations are based on the viewpoints listed on the previous charts.
- The final rule language, which is still under development, may affect the validity of the AAWG recommendations.
- The AAWG is willing to assist the FAA in finalizing the Advisory material, should that be necessary.

Proposed AC 120-AAWG

- Replaces AC 120-YY
- Aligns closely with AAWG and Industry comments on WFD NPRM.
  - LOV instead of IOL
  - LOV determined when the High-Time Airplane reaches DSG
  - Definitive process to develop LOV that engages all sectors
  - Added information concerning how to determine DSG and provided a means to determine if an airplane has exceeded it.
  - Means to extend an LOV follows same path as initial LOV.
  - AC does not address either repairs or alterations.

Proposed Final Report

- Establishes the technical basis of AC 120-AAWG
- Provides FAA with technical rationale for future supplementary rulemaking on repairs and alterations.

Final Report Overview
And
Conclusions and Recommendations

Final Report Overview

- Proposes an AC that addresses actions to be accomplished to preclude the development of WFD in the baseline as delivered structure as modified by any AD.
- Proposes means to include repairs and alterations to both baseline structure as well as repairs to alteration and modifications should in the consideration for WFD.
- Requests the FAA to utilize the AAWG in the final AC development as a technical resource.

The Tasking

- **Conclusions - ARAC Tasking**

1. The AAWG concludes that the simultaneous requirements of developing data to enable operator compliance to both the DT and WFD rules for all applicable airplanes would create a significant resource shortfall across the industry with no clear means to mitigate that short fall.
2. The AAWG concludes that there is insufficient fleet evidence to support a rule for the assessment of RAMs for WFD and that the FAA need not promulgate final rules that contain provision for the assessment of RAMs for WFD.
3. The AAWG concludes that there is a significant cost burden imposed on the TCH, operator and FAA to require separate updates of repair publications and assessments for DT and WFD if requirements for WFD of repairs are mandated at a later time.

The Tasking Con't

- **Conclusions - ARAC Tasking**
  4. The AAWG concludes that the Structures Task Group process will be required to develop the necessary data under §25.WFD for operator compliance to §121.WFD and §129.WFD.
  5. The AAWG concludes that a review of all alterations would create an unnecessary burden on the industry that would not enhance continued airworthiness.
  6. The AAWG concludes that a simplified methodology is needed to support third parties for the WFD development for RAMs.
  7. The AAWG concludes that there is a concern that the subjects discussed in this report have not been harmonized between the FAA and EASA.

The Tasking Con't

- **Recommendations - ARAC Tasking**

1. In support of the ARAC tasking and possible future rulemaking on RAMs, the AAWG has provided the following information.
   a. An analytical methodology to be used by third parties to perform WFD evaluations of repairs and alterations.
   b. Scope of testing required to support WFD evaluations of new repairs and alterations.
   c. Screening process for new repairs and alterations.
   d. Approval process for new repairs and alterations.
   e. Assessing need to evaluate existing repairs and alterations.
2. If the FAA promulgates new rulemaking for assessment of RAMs for WFD, the AAWG recommends that guidance information should be placed in an amended AC 120-WFD.
3. The AAWG recommends that the requirements and means of compliance for Damage Tolerance and Widespread Fatigue Damage in FAA and EASA be harmonized so that there is only a single means of compliance.

Baseline Structure

Conclusions

- **Conclusions**
  1. The AAWG concludes that it is necessary to define the means of compliance for assessing the WFD characteristics of airplane baseline structure before a means of compliance could be defined for repairs and alterations.
  2. The AAWG concludes that airplanes certified prior to 1958 should not be considered for WFD. These aircraft do not fall under consideration for 14 CFR 121.370a or 129.16 for Damage Tolerance, and there is insufficient information to successfully complete a WFD assessment on these airplanes.

Baseline Structure

Conclusions

3. The AAWG concludes that the baseline configuration, including model variants and any mandated modifications as appropriate should be defined prior to the analysis of specific WFD prone areas.
4. The AAWG concludes that an LOV is only required if the high-time airplane will reach and exceed the DSG.
5. The AAWG concludes that the timing of the development of LOV and maintenance actions need to be based on the flight cycles and hours of the high-time airplane relative to the DSG.

Baseline Structure

Conclusions

6. The AAWG concludes that an LOV extension package will take a minimum of 4 years to prepare and should follow the same process used to develop the initial LOV.
7. The AAWG concludes that there is a misunderstanding in the industry of what the DSG represented and has therefore further developed this topic in the report.

Baseline Structure

Recommendations

- **Recommendations**
  1. The AAWG recommends that the FAA adopt AC 120.WFD as a means of compliance for WFD assessment of baseline structure as presented in Appendix C.
  2. The AAWG recommends that the airplanes most at risk for the development of WFD be the first to be evaluated for WFD. These would include all airplanes that have exceeded their DSG.

Baseline Structure

Recommendations

3. The AAWG recommends that the applicability of the WFD rule be changed to match certain applicability requirements of the AASR and EAPAS proposed rule. Specifically, the applicability statement should be amended to include the following criteria - Transport category, turbine-powered airplanes with a type certificate issued after January 1, 1958.
4. The AAWG recommends that the TCH should be allowed to define the structural baseline configuration of the airplane, including all model derivatives incorporating those structural ADs that have a significant effect on the WFD characteristics of the airplane.

Baseline Structure

Recommendations

5. If the high-time airplane has already exceeded the DSG, the AAWG recommends the LOV be made available to the FAA by June 20, 2009 or one and a half years prior to the compliance date of the WFD rule, whichever is later.
6. For airplanes where the high-time airplane is within five years of reaching the DSG, the AAWG recommends the LOV for the baseline structure should be made available to the FAA three and a half years after the effective date of the rule or one and a half years prior to the time the high time airplane reaches DSG, whichever is later.

Baseline Structure

Recommendations

7. For all other airplanes, the AAWG recommends that the process of determining the LOV needs to begin when the high-time airplane reaches 75% DSG or roughly 5 years before it reaches the DSG.
8. The AAWG recommends the operator contact the TCH to initiate LOV extension preparation a minimum of 4 years in advance of the need.
9. The AAWG recommends the TCH establish STG's for the affected airplane models to develop the required data, including the LOV and associated maintenance actions as well as provide technical and economic input to the overall process.

Repairs

- **Conclusions**
  - The AAWG has concludes that there is no information that a properly installed repair has ever exhibited WFD in service.
- **Recommendations**
  1. For airplanes that require updates to their publications for DT and which have airplanes above DSG on December 20, 2009, the AAWG recommends that the update for WFD compliant repair publications occur at the same time.
  2. For all other airplanes, the AAWG recommends that for repairs, WFD is addressed by the TCH by updating their publications (SRMs, SBs, RAG, DT Compliance Document, etc…) to include WFD instructions by the same time they publish the WFD LOV and maintenance actions for the baseline structure.

Repairs
Recommendations

3. For airplanes that qualify under paragraph one above, the AAWG recommends that published repairs be addressed for WFD on a go forward basis and should not occur separately from the DT review for Pre-amendment 45 airplanes.
4. The AAWG recommends that there should be no rulemaking initiative that would require retrospective requirements to re-review repairs for WFD after a DT assessment, unless a specific airworthiness concern is identified.

Alterations

- **Conclusions - Alterations**
  - AAWG concludes that there are certain categories of alterations that have the potential of developing WFD that should be reviewed.
- **Recommendations - Alterations**
  - The AAWG recommends that alterations for WFD be addressed in a two-step approach.
    a. New Alterations certified after the effective date of the §25.WFD should be handled by the change product rule 14 CFR 21.101 by making 14 CFR 25.WFD applicable.
    b. Existing alterations should be categorized into a few special types and reviewed in a FAA Special Certification Review (SCR) with the outcome being a determination if a WFD assessment is necessary in addition to the already required DT assessment.

Discussion of the Proposed Submittal

with the financing of a small concern, has sought an exemption under Section 312 of the Act and Section 107.730, Financings which Constitute Conflicts of Interest of the Small Business Administration (''SBA'') Rules and Regulations (13 CFR 107.730). Emergence Capital Partners SBIC, L.P., proposes to provide equity financing to DVDPlay, Inc. (''DVDPlay''), 695 Campbell Technology Parkway, Suite 200, Campbell, CA 95008. The financing is contemplated to fund the ongoing operating needs of the business.

The financing is brought within the purview of § 107.730(a)(1) of the Regulations because Emergence Capital Partners, L.P., and Emergence Capital Associates, L.P., all Associates of Emergence Capital Partners SBIC, L.P., own more than ten percent of DVDPlay, and therefore DVDPlay is considered an Associate of Emergence Capital Partners SBIC, L.P., as detailed in § 107.50 of the Regulations.

Notice is hereby given that any interested person may submit written comments on the transaction to the Associate Administrator for Investment, U.S. Small Business Administration, 409 Third Street, SW., Washington, DC 20416.

March 12, 2007.

Jaime Guzmán-Fournier,

Associate Administrator for Investment.

[FR Doc. E7–5958 Filed 3–30–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee Meeting on Transport Airplane and Engine Issues

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice announces a public meeting of the FAA's Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC) to discuss transport airplane and engine (TAE) issues.

DATES: The meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 17, 2007 starting at 11 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time. Arrange for oral presentations by April 9, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Ave, SW., Room 810 Washington, DC 20591.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nicanor Davidson, Office of Rulemaking, ARM–207, FAA, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, Telephone (202) 267–5174, FAX (202) 267–5075, or e-mail at *nicanor.davidson@faa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463; 5 U.S.C. app. III), notice is given of an ARAC meeting to be held via teleconference on April 17, 2007. The meeting is being held to vote on the Task 3 report from the Airworthiness Assurance Working Group (AAWG). This ad hoc meeting is necessary because this action from the AAWG is a critical part of FAA's effort to develop new guidance to support the Aging Airplane Safety Final Rule (AASFR).

The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

- Opening Remarks
- AAWG Report and Vote

Attendance is open to the public, but will be limited to the availability of phone lines. Please confirm your attendance with the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section no later than April 9, 2007. Please provide the following information: Full legal name, country of citizenship, and name of your industry association, or applicable affiliation. If you are attending as a public citizen, please indicate so.

For persons participating, the call-in number is (202) 366–3920; the Passcode is ''8489.'' To insure that sufficient telephone lines are available, please notify the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of your intent to participate by April 9, 2007. Anyone calling from outside the Washington, DC metropolitan area will be responsible for paying long-distance charges.

The public must make arrangements by April 9, 2007, to present oral statements at the meeting. Written statements may be presented to the ARAC at any time by providing 25 copies to the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

If you need assistance or require a reasonable accommodation for the meeting or meeting documents, please contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. Sign and oral interpretation, as well as a listening device, can be made available if requested 10 calendar days before the meeting.

Issued in Washington, DC on March 28, 2007.

Pamela Hamilton-Powell,

Director, Office of Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. E7–6058 Filed 3–30–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA–2007–27209]

Notice of Request for Comments on New Information Collection: Survey of Medical Examiners Who Certify the Physical Qualifications of Commercial Motor Vehicle (CMV) Drivers

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

ACTION: Notice; request for information.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, FMCSA announces its plan to submit the Information Collection Request (ICR) described below to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval. The ICR describes a proposed collection activity and its expected cost and burden. The **Federal Register** notice allowing for a 60-day comment period on the ICR was published on June 19, 2006 (71 FR 35324). Four comments were received in response to the notice. Two individuals supported the proposed information collection and two commented on matters outside of the scope of the proposed information collection. These comments are addressed in the ICR that will be submitted to OMB.

DATES: Please send your comments by May 2, 2007. OMB must receive your comments by this date in order to act quickly on the ICR.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 Seventeenth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, *Attention: DOT/FMCSA Desk Officer.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Mary D. Gunnels, Office of Bus and Truck Standards and Operations, Physical Qualifications Division, Department of Transportation, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. Telephone: 202–366–4001, e-mail *maggi.gunnels@fmcsa.dot.gov.* Office hours are from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Survey of Medical Examiners Who Certify the Physical Qualifications of Commercial Motor Rehicle Drivers.

OMB Control Number: 2126–xxxx.

Type of Request: New information collection.