
One of the product exclusions in the Section 301 investigation of China’s Acts, Policies, and Practices Related to Technology Transfer, Intellectual Property, and Innovation, as set out at 85 FR 85831 (December 29, 2020) and 86 FR 13785 (March 10, 2021), is based on one of the amended statistical reporting categories.

B. Technical Amendment to Exclusion

The Annex to this notice conforms an existing product exclusion with the July 1, 2021 changes to ten-digit statistical reporting categories in the HTSUS.

In particular, the Annex makes a technical amendment to U.S. note 20(qqq)(4) to subchapter III of chapter 99 of the HTSUS, as set out in the Annexes to the notices published at 85 FR 85831 (December 29, 2020) and 86 FR 13785 (March 10, 2021).

Annex

Effective with respect to goods entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after 12:01 a.m. eastern daylight time on July 1, 2021, U.S. note 20(qqq)(4) to subchapter III of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is modified by deleting “3808.94.5095 effective July 1, 2021” in lieu thereof.

Greta Peisch,
General Counsel, Office of the United States Trade Representative.
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AGENCY: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of denials.

SUMMARY: FMCSA announces its decision to deny applications from 27 individuals who requested an exemption from the vision standard in the FMCSRs.

The Agency’s decision regarding these exemption applications is based on medical reports about the applicants’ vision, and also their driving records and experience driving with the vision deficiency.

IV. Conclusion

The Agency has determined that these applicants do not satisfy the eligibility criteria or meet the terms and conditions of the Federal exemption and granting these exemptions would not provide a level of safety that would be equivalent to, or greater than, the level of safety that would be obtained by complying with § 391.41(b)(10).

The 27 applicants in this notice have been denied exemptions from the physical qualification standards in § 391.41(b)(10).

Each applicant has, prior to this notice, received a letter of final disposition regarding his/her exemption request. Those decision letters fully outlined the basis for the denial and constitute final action by the Agency. This notice summarizes the Agency’s recent denials as required under 49 U.S.C. 31315(b)(4) by periodically publishing names and reasons for denial.

The following applicant, Michael S. Hundley (KS), did not have sufficient driving experience over the past three years under normal highway operating conditions:

The following 11 applicants had no experience operating a CMV:

Erik R. Almquist (NC)
Gregory M. Flowers (MS)
Alexander A.D. Garcia (CA)
Kenrick W. Hamilton (NV)
Cody R. Hare (PA)
Thomas W. Kurutz (PA)
William F. McEvoy (IL)
Kyle R. Mckenna (WA)
Joel R. Mitchell (FL)
Abdi S. Negeri (OR)
Merhawi Tesfay (NV)

The following five applicants did not have 3 years of experience driving a CMV on public highways with their vision deficiencies:

Bryan J. Teaster (NC)
Robbie R. Austin (ID)
Owen R. Powell (WI)
Jared L. Coleman (VA)
Zachary J. Rowzee (MS)

The following two applicants did not have 3 years of recent experience driving a CMV on public highways with their vision deficiencies:

Russell Askew (KS); Terrance A. Nicely (IN)

The following three applicants did not have sufficient driving experience over the past 3 years under normal
highway operating conditions (gaps in driving record): Mario A. Martinez Borroto (TX); James E. Marsh (UT); Donald L. Elsberry (IA)
The following applicant, Charles D. Parks (OH), did not demonstrate the level of safety required for interstate driving (excessive moving/non-moving violations during 3-year period).
The following two applicants were denied for multiple reasons: Jason Beer (NE); Armando Palomino Gonzalez (OK)
The following applicant, Dave Counts (IN), has not had stable vision for the preceding 3-year period.
The following applicant, Jatinder K. Mahi (CA), does not meet the vision standard in his better eye.
Larry W. Minor, Associate Administrator for Policy.

I. Public Participation
A. Viewing Comments
To view comments go to www.regulations.gov. Insert the docket number, FMCSA–2021–0007, in the keyword box, and click "Search." Next, sort the results by "Posted (Newer-Older)," choose the first notice listed, and click "Browse Comments."” If you do not have access to the internet, you may view the docket online by visiting Dockets Operations in Room W12–140 on the ground floor of the DOT West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590–0001, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., ET, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 366–9317 or (202) 366–9826 before visiting Dockets Operations.

B. Privacy Act
In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553(c), DOT solicits comments from the public to better inform its rulemaking process. DOT posts these comments, without edit, including any personal information the commenter provides, to www.regulations.gov, as described in the system of records notice (DOT/ALL–14 FDMS), which can be reviewed at www.transportation.gov/privacy.

II. Background
On June 9, 2021, FMCSA published a notice announcing receipt of applications from 13 individuals requesting an exemption from vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10) and requested comments from the public (86 FR 30672). The public comment period ended on July 9, 2021, and no comments were received.
FMCSA has evaluated the eligibility of these applicants and determined that granting the exemptions to these individuals would achieve a level of safety equivalent to, or greater than, the level that would be achieved by complying with §391.41(b)(10).
The physical qualification standard for drivers regarding vision found in §391.41(b)(10) states that a person is physically qualified to drive a CMV 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 red, green, and amber.

III. Discussion of Comments
FMCSA received no comments in this proceeding.

IV. Basis for Exemption Determination
Under 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315(b), FMCSA may grant an exemption from the FMCSRs for no longer than a 5-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 5-year period. FMCSA grants medical exemptions from the FMCSRs for a 2-year period to align with the maximum duration of a driver’s medical certification.
The Agency’s decision regarding these exemption applications is based on medical reports about the applicants’ vision, as well as their driving records and experience driving with the vision deficiency. The qualifications, experience, and medical condition of each applicant were stated and discussed in detail in the June 9, 2021, Federal Register notice (86 FR 30672) and will not be repeated here.

FMCSA recognizes that some drivers do not meet the vision requirement but have adapted their driving to accommodate their limitation and demonstrated their ability to drive safely. The 13 exemption applicants listed in this notice are in this category. They are unable to meet the vision requirement in one eye for various reasons, including amblyopia, cataracts, corneal scarring, macular scarring, prosthesis, retinal deformity, retinal detachment, and retinal scarring. In most cases, their eye conditions did not develop recently. Nine of the applicants were either born with their vision impairments or have had them since childhood. The four individuals that developed their vision conditions as adults have had them for a range of 4 to 30 years. Although each applicant has one eye that does not meet the vision requirement in §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.

Doctors’ opinions are supported by the applicants’ possession of a valid license to operate a CMV. By meeting State licensing requirements, the applicants demonstrated their ability to operate a CMV with their limited vision in intrastate commerce, even though their vision disqualified them from driving in interstate commerce. We believe that the applicants’ intrastate