would likely achieve a level of safety that is equivalent to, or greater than, the level that would be achieved absent such exemption." The procedures for requesting an exemption (including renewals) are set out in 49 CFR Part 381. This notice addresses 22 individuals who have requested renewal of their exemptions in a timely manner. The FMCSA has evaluated these 22 applications for renewal on their merits and decided to extend each exemption for a renewable 2-year period.

They are: Terry J. Aldridge, Jerry D. Bridges, Michael L. Brown, Roosevelt Bryant, James C. Bryce, Thomas P. Cummings, Ralph E. Eckles, Marion R. Fox, Jr., Gary R. Gutschow, Richard J. Hanna, Peter L. Haubruck, James J. Hewitt, John K. Love, Albert E. Malley, Eldon Miles, Rodney M. Mimbs, Walter F. Moniowczak, Marvin L. Swillie, Jr., Robert Tatum, Thomas E. Walsh, Kevin P. Weinhold, and Thomas A. Wise.

These exemptions are extended subject to the following conditions: (1) That each individual have a physical exam 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 and retain a copy of the certification on his/her person while driving for presentation to a duly authorized Federal, State, or local enforcement official. Each exemption will be valid for 2 years unless rescinded earlier by the FMCSA. The exemption will be rescinded if: (1) The person fails to comply with the terms and conditions of the exemption; (2) the exemption has resulted in a lower level of safety than was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(e).

#### **Basis for Renewing Exemptions**

Under 49 U.S.C. 31315(b)(1), an exemption may be granted for no longer than 2 years from its approval date and may be renewed upon application for additional 2-year periods. In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31315 and 31136(e), each of the 22 applicants has satisfied the entry conditions for obtaining an exemption from the vision requirements

(63 FR 66226, 64 FR 16517, 66 FR 41656, 64 FR 27027, 64 FR 51568, 66 FR 63289, 64 FR 40404, 64 FR 66962, 64 FR 68195, 65 FR 20251, 65 FR 45817, 65 FR 77066, 65 FR 78256, 66 FR 16311). Each of these 22 applicants has requested timely renewal of the exemption and has submitted evidence showing that the vision in the better eye continues to meet the standard specified at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10) and that the vision impairment is stable. In addition, a review of each record of safety while driving with the respective vision deficiencies over the past 2 years indicates each applicant continues to meet the vision exemption standards. These factors provide an adequate basis for predicting each driver's ability to continue to drive safely in interstate commerce. Therefore, the FMCSA concludes that extending the exemption for each renewal applicant for a period of 2 years is likely to achieve a level of safety equal to that existing without the exemption.

#### Comments

The FMCSA will review comments received at any time concerning a particular driver's safety record and determine if the continuation of the exemption is consistent with the requirements at 49 U.S.C. 31315 and 31136(e). However, the FMCSA requests that interested parties with specific data concerning the safety records of these drivers submit comments by December 17, 2003.

In the past the FMCSA has received comments from Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety (Advocates) expressing continued opposition to the FMCSA's procedures for renewing exemptions from the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). Specifically, Advocates objects to the agency's extension of the exemptions without any opportunity for public comment prior to the decision to renew, and reliance on a summary statement of evidence to make its decision to extend the exemption of each driver.

The issues raised by Advocates were addressed at length in 66 FR 17994 (April 4, 2001). The FMCSA continues to find its exemption process appropriate to the statutory and regulatory requirements.

Issued on: November 10, 2003.

### Pamela M. Pelcovits,

*Office Director, Policy, Plans, and Regulations.* 

[FR Doc. 03–28620 Filed 11–14–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

#### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2003-16481]

## Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1991– 1994 Mercedes Benz S Class (140 Car Line) Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT. **ACTION:** Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1991–1994 Mercedes Benz S Class (140 car line) passenger cars are eligible for importation.

**SUMMARY:** This document announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that 1991-1994 Mercedes Benz S Class (140 car line) passenger cars that were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are eligible for importation into the United States because (1) they are substantially similar to vehicles that were originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States and that were certified by their manufacturer as complying with the safety standards, and (2) they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

**DATES:** The closing date for comments on the petition is December 17, 2003. ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to the docket number and notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590 (docket hours are from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.). Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the Federal Register published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477-78) or you may visit http://dms.dot.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Coleman Sachs, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202–366–3151).

# SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

## Background

Under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A), a motor vehicle that was not originally manufactured to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards shall be refused admission into the United States unless NHTSA has decided that the motor vehicle is substantially similar to a motor vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States, certified under 49 U.S.C. 30115, and of the same model year as the model of the motor vehicle to be compared, and is capable of being readily altered to conform to all applicable Federal motor

vehicle safety standards. Petitions for eligibility decisions may be submitted by either manufacturers or importers who have registered with NHTSA pursuant to 49 CFR part 592. As specified in 49 CFR 593.7, NHTSA publishes notice in the Federal Register of each petition that it receives, and affords interested persons an opportunity to comment on the petition. At the close of the comment period, NHTSA decides, on the basis of the petition and any comments that it has received, whether the vehicle is eligible for importation. The agency then publishes this decision in the Federal Register.

Sunshine Car Import L.C. of Cape Coral, Florida ("SCI") (Registered Importer 01–289) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1991–1994 Mercedes Benz S Class (140 car line) passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles which SCI believes are substantially similar are 1991–1994 Mercedes Benz S Class (140 car line) passenger cars that were manufactured for importation into, and sale in, the United States and certified by their manufacturer as conforming to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared non-U.S. certified 1991–1994 Mercedes Benz S Class (140 car line) passenger cars to their U.S.-certified counterparts, and found the vehicles to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

SCI submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 1991–1994 Mercedes Benz S Class (140 car line) passenger cars, as originally manufactured, conform to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as their U.S. certified counterparts, or are capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that non-U.S. certified 1991–1994 Mercedes Benz S Class (140 car line) passenger cars are identical to their U.S. certified counterparts with respect to compliance with Standard Nos. 102 *Transmission Shift Lever Sequence*, 103 *Defrosting and Defogging Systems*, 104 *Windshield* 

Wiping and Washing Systems, 105 Hydraulic Brake Systems, 106 Brake Hoses, 109 New Pneumatic Tires, 113 Hood Latch Systems, 116 Brake Fluid, 124 Accelerator Control Systems, 201 Occupant Protection in Interior Impact, 202 Head Restraints, 204 Steering Control Rearward Displacement, 205 Glazing Materials, 206 Door Locks and Door Retention Components, 207 Seating Systems, 209 Seat Belt Assemblies, 210 Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages, 212 Windshield Mounting, 216 Roof Crush Resistance, 219 Windshield Zone Intrusion, and 302 Flammability of Interior Materials.

The petitioner also contends that the vehicles are capable of being readily altered to meet the following standards, in the manner indicated:

Standard No. 101 *Controls and Displays:* (a) inscription of the word "brake" on the instrument cluster in place of the international ECE warning symbol; (b) replacement or conversion of the speedometer to read in miles per hours.

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment:* (a) Installation of U.S.-model headlamps and front side marker lights; (b) installation of U.S.-model tail lamp assemblies that incorporate rear side marker lights; (c) installation of a U.S.model high mounted stop lamp.

Standard No. 110 *Tire Selection and Rims:* installation of a tire information placard.

Standard No. 111 *Rearview Mirror:* replacement of the passenger side rearview mirror with a U.S.-model component or inscription of the required warning statement on the mirror's face.

Standard No. 114 *Theft Protection:* installation of a key warning buzzer.

Standard No. 118 *Power Window Systems:* installation of a relay in the power window system so that the window transport will not operate with the ignition switched off.

Standard No. 208 Occupant Crash Protection:

(a) Reprogramming of the instrument cluster software to activate the seat belt warning buzzer; (b) inspection of all vehicles and replacement of the driver's and passenger's air bags, control units, sensors, and seat belts with U.S.-model components on vehicles that are not already so equipped. The petitioner states that the vehicles should be equipped at the front and rear outboard seating positions with combination lap and shoulder belts that are selftensioning and that release by means of a single red pushbutton and with a lap belt at the rear center seating position. The petitioner further states that the

vehicles are equipped with a seat belt warning lamp that is identical to the lamp installed on U.S.-certified models.

Standard No. 214 *Side Impact Protection:* inspection of all vehicles to ensure that they are equipped with door beams identical to those in the U.S. certified model and installation of those components on vehicles that are not already so equipped.

Standard No. 301 *Fuel System Integrity:* inspection of all vehicles to ensure that they are equipped with a roll over valve with the same part number as the U.S.-model component, and installation of that component on vehicles that are not already so equipped.

The petitioner states that all vehicles must be inspected for compliance with the Bumper Standard found in 49 CFR part 581 and that U.S.-model components necessary to achieve compliance with the standard must be installed on vehicles that are not already so equipped.

The petitioner also states that a vehicle identification plate must be affixed to the vehicles near the left windshield post and a reference and certification label must be affixed in the area of the left front door post to meet the requirements of 49 CFR part 565. The petitioner further states that a certification label must be affixed to the driver's door latch post to meet the requirements of 49 CFR part 567.

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on the petition described above. Comments should refer to the docket number and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590 (docket hours are from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.). It is requested but not required that 10 copies be submitted.

All comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated above will be considered, and will be available for examination in the docket at the above address both before and after that date. To the extent possible, comments filed after the closing date will also be considered. Notice of final action on the petition will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A) and (b)(1); 49 CFR 593.8; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on: November 12, 2003.

### Kenneth N. Weinstein,

Associate Administrator for Enforcement. [FR Doc. 03–28621 Filed 11–14–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910-59–P