the application. Section 158.25(c)(1)(ii)(B) requires that this environmental review be complete for an application submitted for authority to use PFC revenue. In addition, the FAA requested that the Greater Orlando Aviation Authority provide additional information on the projects contained in the application.

The environmental review of the projects in the application is now complete and the Greater Orlando Aviation Authority has submitted the supplemental information to complete this application. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, not later than July 11, 2014.

The following is a brief overview of the application:

Application Number: 14–17–C–00–MCO.

Proposed charge effective date: July 1, 2034.

Proposed charge expiration date: August 1, 2038.

Level of the proposed PFC: \$4.50.

Total estimated PFC revenue:
\$460,000,000.

Brief description of proposed project(s): South Airport Automated People Mover (APM) System, Stations, and Associated Facilities—Design and Construction; South Airport Automated People Mover (APM) System—Roadways, Curbs, and Infrastructure—Design and Construction; South Airport APM Ticketing and Baggage Check-In Facility—Design and Construction.

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 office located at: FAA Southern Region Headquarters, 1701 Columbia Avenue, College Park, Georgia 30337.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the offices of the Greater Orlando Aviation Authority.

Issued in Orlando, Florida on March 20, 2014.

Bart Vernace,

Manager, Orlando Airports District Office, Southern Region, Federal Aviation Administration.

[FR Doc. 2014–07290 Filed 4–1–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee Open Meeting

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee open meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, notice is hereby given of a meeting of the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee (COMSTAC).

DATES: The meeting will take place on Wednesday, May 7, 2014, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., and Thursday, May 8, 2014, from 8:30 a.m. to 2 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will take place at the National Transportation Safety Board Conference Center, 429 L'Enfant Plaza SW., Washington, DC 20594.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Larry Scott, telephone (202) 267–7982; email *larry.scott@faa.gov*, FAA Office of Commercial Space Transportation (AST–3), 800 Independence Avenue SW., Room 331, Washington, DC 20591. **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This will be the 59th meeting of the COMSTAC.

The proposed schedule for the COMSTAC working group meetings on May 7 is below:

- —Operations (8 a.m.-10 a.m.)
- —Business/Legal (10 a.m.-12 a.m.)
- —Systems (1 p.m.-3 p.m.)
- —International Space Policy (3 p.m.–5 p.m.)

The full Committee will meet on May 8. The proposed agenda for that meeting features speakers relevant to the commercial space transportation industry; and reports and recommendations from the working groups.

Interested members of the public may submit relevant written statements for the COMSTAC members to consider under the advisory process. Statements may concern the issues and agenda items mentioned above and/or additional issues that may be relevant for the U.S. commercial space transportation industry. Interested parties wishing to submit written statements should contact Larry Scott, COMSTAC Designated Federal Officer, (the Contact Person listed in FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT) in writing (mail or email) by April 30, 2014, so that the information can be made available to COMSTAC members for their review and consideration before the May 7 and 8 meetings.

Written statements should be supplied in the following formats: One hard copy with original signature and/or one electronic copy via email.

A portion of the May 8 meeting will be unavailable to the public (starting at

approximately 2 p.m.).

An agenda will be posted on the FAA Web site at www.faa.gov/go/ast. For specific information concerning the times and locations of the COMSTAC working group meetings, contact the Contact Person listed below.

Individuals who plan to attend and need special assistance, such as sign language interpretation or other reasonable accommodations, should inform the Contact Persons listed below in advance of the meeting.

Complete information regarding COMSTAC is available on the FAA Web site at: http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/ast/advisory_committee/.

This notice is given pursuant to Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 5 U.S.C. App. 2).

Issued in Washington, DC, March 25, 2014. George C. Nield,

Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation.

[FR Doc. 2014–07288 Filed 4–1–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA-2013-0126]

Qualification of Drivers; Application for Exemptions; Hearing

AGENCY: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), DOT. **ACTION:** Notice of applications for exemptions; request for comments.

SUMMARY: FMCSA announces that 4 individuals have applied for a medical exemption from the hearing requirement in the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs). In accordance with the statutory requirements concerning applications for exemptions, FMCSA requests public comments on these requests. The statute and implementing regulations concerning exemptions require that exemptions must provide an equivalent or greater level of safety than if they were not granted. If the Agency determines the exemptions would satisfy the statutory requirements and decides to grant theses requests after reviewing the public comments submitted in response to this notice, the exemptions would

enable 4 individuals to operate CMVs in interstate commerce.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 2, 2014.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments bearing the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Docket No. FMCSA—2013—0126 using any of the following methods:

- Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
- Mail: Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590–0001.
- Hand Delivery: West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., ET, Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.
 - Fax: 1-202-493-2251.

Instructions: Each submission must include the Agency name and the docket numbers for this notice. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided. Please see the Privacy Act heading below for further information.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments, go to http:// www.regulations.gov at any time or Room W12-140 on the ground level of the West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., ET, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The FDMS is available 24 hours each day, 365 days each year. If you want acknowledgment that we received your comments, please include a selfaddressed, stamped envelope or postcard or print the acknowledgement page that appears after submitting comments on-line.

Privacy Act: Anyone may search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or of the person signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's Privacy Act Statement for the FDMS published in the Federal Register on January 17, 2008 (73 FR 3316), or you may visit http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2008/pdf/E8-785.pdf.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elaine M. Papp, Chief Medical Programs, (202) 366–4001, fmcsamedical@dot.gov, FMCSA,

Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Room W64– 224, Washington, DC 20590–0001. Office hours are from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration has authority to grant exemptions from many of the Federal **Motor Carrier Safety Regulations** (FMCSRs) under 49 U.S.C. 31315 and 31136(e), as amended by Section 4007 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) (Pub. L. 105-178, June 9, 1998, 112 Stat. 107, 401). FMCSA has published in 49 CFR part 381, subpart C final rules implementing the statutory changes in its exemption procedures made by section 4007, 69 FR 51589 (August 20, 2004).1 Under the rules in part 381, subpart C, FMCSA must publish a notice of each exemption request in the Federal Register. The Agency must provide the public with an opportunity to inspect the information relevant to the application, including any safety analyses that have been conducted and any research reports, technical papers and other publications referenced in the application. The Agency must also provide an opportunity to submit public comment on the applications for exemption.

The Agency reviews the safety analyses and the public comments and determines whether granting the exemption would likely achieve a level of safety equivalent to or greater than the level that would be achieved without the exemption. The decision of the Agency must be published in the **Federal Register**. If the Agency denies the request, it must state the reason for doing so. If the decision is to grant the exemption, the notice must specify the person or class of persons receiving the exemption and the regulatory provision or provisions from which an exemption is granted. The notice must also specify the effective period of the exemption (up to 2 years) and explain the terms and conditions of the exemption. The exemption may be renewed.

The current provisions of the FMCSRs concerning hearing state that a person is physically qualified to drive a CMV if that person

First perceives a forced whispered voice in the better ear at not less than 5 feet with or without the use of a hearing aid or, if tested by use of an audiometric device, does not have an average hearing loss in the better ear greater than 40 decibels at 500 Hz, 1,000 Hz, and 2,000 Hz with or without a hearing aid when the audiometric device is calibrated to American National Standard (formerly ASA Standard) Z24.5—1951.

49 CFR 391.41(b)(11). This standard was adopted in 1970, with a revision in 1971 to allow drivers to be qualified under this standard while wearing a hearing aid, 35 FR 6458, 6463 (April 22, 1970) and 36 FR 12857 (July 3, 1971).

FMCSA also issues instructions for completing the medical examination report and includes advisory criteria on the report itself to provide guidance for medical examiners in applying the hearing standard. See 49 CFR 391.43(f). The current advisory criteria for the hearing standard include a reference to a report entitled "Hearing Disorders and Commercial Motor Vehicle Drivers" prepared for the Federal Highway Administration, FMCSA's predecessor, in 1993.²

FMCSA Requests Comments on the Exemption Applications

FMCSA requests comments from all interested parties on whether a driver who cannot meet the hearing standard should be permitted to operate a CMV in interstate commerce. Further, the Agency asks for comments on whether a driver who cannot meet the hearing standard should be limited to operating only certain types of vehicles in interstate commerce, for example, vehicles without air brakes. The statute and implementing regulations concerning exemptions require that the Agency request public comments on all applications for exemptions. The Agency is also required to make a determination that an exemption would likely achieve a level of safety that is equivalent to, or greater than, the level that would be achieved absent such exemption before granting any such requests. 49 U.S.C. 31136 and 31315.

Submitting Comments

You may submit your comments and material online or by fax, mail, or hand delivery, but please use only one of these means. FMCSA recommends that you include your name and a mailing address, an email address, or a phone number in the body of your document so that FMCSA can contact you if there are questions regarding your submission.

To submit your comment online, go to http://www.regulations.gov and in the search box insert the docket number

¹ This action adopted as final rules the interim final rules issued by FMCSA's predecessor in 1998 (63 FR 67600 (Dec. 8, 2008)), and adopted by FMCSA in 2001 [66 FR 49867 (Oct. 1, 2001)].

² This report is available on the FMCSA Web site at http://www.fmcsa.dot.gov/facts-research/research-technology/publications/medreport_archives.htm.

"FMCSA-2013-0126" and click the search button. When the new screen appears, click on the blue "Comment Now!" button on the right hand side of the page. On the new page, enter information required including the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation. If you submit your comments by mail or hand delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you submit comments by mail and would like to know that they reached the facility, please enclose a stamped, selfaddressed postcard or envelope.

We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period and may change this proposed rule based on your comments. FMCSA may issue a final rule at any time after the close of the comment period.

Viewing Comments and Documents

To view comments, as well as any documents mentioned in this preamble, and to submit your comment online, go to http://www.regulations.gov and in the search box insert the docket number "FMCSA-2013-0126" and click "Search." Next, click "Open Docket Folder" and you will find all documents and comments related to the proposed rulemaking.

Information on Individual Applicants

Rodney Braden

Mr. Braden, 47, holds an operator's license in Kentucky.

Arthur Brown

Mr. Brown, 46, holds an operator's license in Kentucky.

Anthony Castile, III

Mr. Castile, 44, holds an operator's license in Pennsylvania.

Michael Steggs

Mr. Steggs, 53, holds a Class A commercial driver's license (CDL) in Texas.

Request for Comments

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315(b)(4), FMCSA requests public comment from all interested persons on the exemption petitions described in this notice. The Agency will consider all comments received before the close of business May 2, 2014. Comments will be available for examination in the docket at the location listed under the ADDRESSES section of this notice. The Agency will file comments received after the comment closing date in the public docket, and will consider them to

the extent practicable. In addition to late comments, FMCSA will also continue to file, in the public docket, relevant information that becomes available after the comment closing date. Interested persons should monitor the public docket for new material.

Issued on: March 18, 2014.

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator for Policy. [FR Doc. 2014–07205 Filed 4–1–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-EX-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board [Docket No. FD 35752]

Grafton & Upton Railroad Company— Petition for Declaratory Order; Corrected Decision ¹

Grafton & Upton Railroad Company (G&U) filed a petition for a declaratory order on July 24, 2013, requesting a finding that 49 U.S.C. 10501(b) preempts certain state and local permitting and preclearance statutes and regulations that the Town of Grafton, Mass. (Grafton or the Town) seeks to enforce in connection with G&U's construction and operation of a liquefied petroleum gas (propane) transload facility on a five-acre parcel (the Parcel) that G&U owns in North Grafton. G&U states that it intends to use the facility to transfer propane received by tank car in North Grafton to storage tanks and then to trucks for delivery to propane dealers in New England. Pending the completion of the construction, G&U intends to use portable equipment to transload the propane. For the reasons discussed below, a declaratory order proceeding will be instituted and a procedural schedule will be adopted.

The Parcel is located immediately adjacent to G&U's line and existing rail yard.² In December 2012, G&U notified the Town that four propane storage tanks were about to be delivered to its rail yard. The Town responded by

issuing a cease and desist order to halt construction and by filing a complaint in the Superior Court for Worcester County, Mass. (Court), arguing that construction of the transload facility would be illegal and would violate the Town's zoning bylaws. These actions ultimately resulted in the Court entering two orders on June 12, 2013, which: (1) enjoined the delivery of the storage tanks; (2) directed G&U to comply with the cease and desist order; (3) stayed the Court proceedings pending a determination by the Board concerning the applicability of § 10501(b); and (4) referred the preemption issue to the Board, directing G&U to file a petition for declaratory order.

In the petition, G&U requests that the Board find that Grafton is preempted from enforcing state and local permitting and preclearance statutes and regulations in connection with both the construction and operation of the transload facility and the interim use of portable transload equipment. Grafton, in a reply filed on August 19, 2013, agrees that the Board should institute a declaratory order proceeding here. It questions whether G&U can and will finance, complete, and operate the transload facility on its own in view of certain agreements G&U had previously entered into with a number of propane companies. The Town argues that a full investigation should be conducted to prevent what it characterizes as an abuse of the preemption doctrine.3 On September 9, 2013, G&U filed a motion for leave to supplement its petition and a supplement containing copies of the various agreements documenting the termination of its arrangements with these propane companies. Grafton filed a reply in opposition on September 17, 2013.

The Board has discretionary authority under 5 U.S.C. 554(e) and 49 U.S.C. 721 to issue a declaratory order to eliminate a controversy or remove uncertainty. Here, a controversy exists as to whether G&U would be the financier, owner, and operator of the proposed transload facility and whether the Town's enforcement of state and local permitting and preclearance statutes and regulations in connection with the facility is preempted under § 10501(b). The Board will therefore institute a declaratory order proceeding and

¹ This decision clarifies the language in footnote 2 of the January 27, 2014 decision served in this proceeding. This action is being taken in response to a letter filed by the Massachusetts Department of Fire Services (DFS). Former footnote 2 (now footnote 3) now states that DFS supports the institution of a declaratory order proceeding.

²In a separate decision also served today, the Board issued a declaratory order holding that preclearance regulations and other requirements of the Town of Grafton, Mass., that would prohibit or unreasonably interfere with the construction and operation of an additional rail yard and storage tracks also on the Parcel are preempted by federal law. See Grafton & Upton Railroad—Pet. for Declaratory Order, FD 35779 (served Jan. 27, 2014).

³ The American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association filed a letter in support of the petition on August 12, 2013. On August 23, 2013, DFS filed a reply in support of the Town's request that the Board institute a declaratory order proceeding, and the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection filed a reply in opposition to G&U's petition, contending that the petition is moot as a result of a settlement it negotiated with G&U.