Application of Multiple Regression Analysis of a Poisson Process,” Journal of the American Statistical Association, June 1971. A 1964 California Driver Record Study prepared by the California Department of Motor Vehicles concluded that the best overall crash 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 27 applicants, one of the applicants had a traffic violation for speeding, one of the applicants had a traffic violation for failure to obey a traffic sign and another had a traffic violation for failure to yield the right of way to another vehicle, and one applicant was involved in a crash. 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 that 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 between them are more compact. 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/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 is granting the exemptions for the 2-year period allowed by 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315 to the 27 applicants listed in the notice of November 19, 2009 (74 FR 60022). We recognize that the vision of an applicant may change and affect his/her ability to operate a CMV as safely as in the past. As a condition of the exemption, therefore, FMCSA will impose requirements on the 27 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 no comments in this proceeding.

Conclusion

Based upon its evaluation of the 27 exemption applications, FMCSA exempts Teddy S. Bioni, John K. Butler, James J. Coffield, Roy E. Crayne, Ralph G. DeBardi, James A. DuBay, Chad D. Grose, Donald E. Halvorson, Gerald Harrison, Roger D. Kool, Curtis M. Lawless, Michael E. Lindquist, Philip J.C. Locke, Travis J. Luce, Cameron S. McMillen, Carl L. Miles, Rashawn L. Morris, Brian T. Nelson, James C. New, Thomas E. O’Compo, Christopher M. Rivera, Richard J. Robb, Larry L. Sapp, Temesg H. Tekleziog, Robert E. Whitney, Robert D. Williams, and James M. Wood from the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10), subject to the requirements cited above (49 CFR 391.64(b)). In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, 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. 31136 and 31315. 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.
Background

Under 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, 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. The comment period ended on December 30, 2009 (74 FR 62632).

Discussion of Comments

FMCSA received no comments in this proceeding.

Conclusion


In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, each renewal 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 level of safety that 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. 31136 and 31315.

Issued on: January 22, 2010.

Charles A. Horan III,
Acting Associate Administrator for Policy and Program Development.

[FR Doc. 2010–1765 Filed 1–27–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Order Granting a Temporary Exemption From Certain Government Securities Act Provisions and Regulations in Connection With a Request From ICE Trust U.S. LLC Related to Central Clearing of Credit Default Swaps, and Request for Comments

AGENCY: Department of the Treasury, Office of the Under Secretary for Domestic Finance.

ACTION: Notice of temporary exemption.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Treasury (Treasury) is issuing a temporary exemption from certain Government Securities Act of 1986 provisions and regulations in connection with a request from ICE Trust U.S. LLC to accommodate customer clearing of credit default swaps that reference government securities. Treasury is also soliciting public comment on this order.

DATES: Effective Date: January 28, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lori Santamorena, Lee Grandy, or Kevin Hawkins, Bureau of the Public Debt, Department of the Treasury, at 202–504–3632.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following is Treasury’s order providing a temporary exemption:

I. Introduction


On March 6, 2009, Treasury granted temporary exemptions from certain GSA provisions and regulations to ICE Trust U.S. LLC, formerly ICE US Trust LLC (ICE Trust), certain ICE Trust participants, and certain eligible contract participants (ECPs) (the March 6, 2009 order). On December 7, 2009, Treasury extended the expiration date of these exemptions until March 7, 2010 (the December 7, 2009 order). In response to a request from ICE Trust (the request), ICE Trust also requested that Treasury grant supplemental exemptive relief to permit the clearance of credit default swaps (CDS) transactions on behalf of customers of ICE Trust clearing members. ICE Trust requested an exemption for clearing members, including certain entities affiliated with ICE Trust clearing members, from provisions of the Exchange Act governing government securities transactions, to the extent such provisions would otherwise apply to such clearing members in regard to cleared CDS.\footnote{A CDS is a bilateral contract between two parties, known as counterparties. The value of this financial contract is based on underlying obligations of a single entity (“reference entity”) or on a particular security or other debt obligation, or an index of several such entities, securities, or obligations. The obligation of a seller to make payments under a CDS contract is triggered by a default or other credit event as to such entity or entities or such security or securities. Investors may use the CDS for a variety of reasons, including to offset or insure against risk in their fixed-income portfolios, to take positions in bonds or in segments of the debt market as represented by an index, or to take positions on the volatility in credit spreads during times of economic uncertainty.}

\footnote{ICE Trust stated that, for purposes of its request, an affiliate means an entity that directly, or indirectly through one or more intermedieraries, controls or is controlled by, or that is under common control with, a clearing member.}

\footnote{For purposes of this order, cleared CDS means a credit default swap that is submitted (or offered, purchased, or sold on terms providing for submission) to ICE Trust, that is offered only to, purchased only by, and sold only to ECPs (as defined in Section 1a(12) of the Commodity Exchange Act as in effect on the date of this order).}