

Section 1310 specifically states that the standards for designation of an Interstate Oasis shall include standards relating to "the appearance of a facility." The FHWA does not believe that it is feasible to prescribe uniform nationwide standards for facility appearance, in terms of building design, site layout, or other potential elements of appearance. The FHWA believes that the minimum eligibility criteria, plus the use of a standard nationwide Interstate Oasis symbol (logo) on official traffic signs and on private business signing of designated facilities, will meet the intent of assuring that travelers can readily identify the specific locations of facilities meeting the required criteria.

The proposed Interstate highway signing requirements for exits providing access to an Interstate Oasis generally follow the principles of General Services and Specific Services signing, as established in Part 2 of the MUTCD, and the FHWA's Interim Approval dated September 6, 2005, for use of "RV Friendly" symbol "patches" on Specific Services signs. The complete MUTCD and FHWA's September 6, 2005, Interim Approval can be accessed at FHWA's MUTCD Web site at <http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov>. Proposed sign numbers and figure numbers in the draft text are indeterminate at this time and will be finalized in the completed document.

Specific Questions on Which FHWA Is Seeking Comments

The FHWA is requesting comments on this proposed Interstate Oasis program as described above. The FHWA is also seeking comments and input regarding several specific questions to help refine and finalize the program:

1. Is 3 miles an appropriate maximum distance from the interchange? The maximum distance specified in MUTCD Section 2F.01 for specific services is 3 miles. If the concept of identifying an Interstate Oasis by adding a "patch" to the Specific Service logo panel is used, consistency in the distance policies may be needed. States would have the flexibility to require a closer distance in their State policies, especially if a State's laws limit certain trucks to a lesser distance when traveling off the Interstate system. However, in some sparsely populated areas, it may be difficult to find any facilities within 3 miles that would qualify as an Interstate Oasis along very long sections of Interstate highways. Should States have the flexibility to extend the 3-mile maximum (as they can do for existing Specific Services) in cases such as this?

2. Should the criteria for safe and convenient access to and from a potential Interstate Oasis facility, and for adequate on-site geometry, be more specific, or is it sufficient to require the States to perform an engineering study to make these determinations?

3. Should the minimum national criteria require a specific minimum number of parking spaces for cars and/or heavy trucks, or a specific minimum percentage of total spaces that must be designed for use by heavy trucks? If so, what should those numbers be and on what basis or rationale are they recommended?

4. Are there other products and services beyond those listed that are essential for inclusion in the minimum national criteria for designation as an Interstate Oasis? States will have the flexibility to add their own requirements for products and/or services beyond the national minimums. However, States will not have the ability to waive any required products or services contained in the minimum national criteria.

5. Should States have the flexibility to designate and sign an exit for an Interstate Oasis if all the criteria cannot be met by any one business at the exit, but the combination of two or more businesses in close proximity to each other do meet the criteria? For example, one particular business may meet all criteria except offering fuel, but fuel is continuously available from another nearby business. In areas where no public rest areas are available for very long distances along the Interstate highway, would allowing States this flexibility for Interstate Oasis designation better serve the public need?

6. What symbol (logo) should be used to indicate an Interstate Oasis? The symbol must be simple, conspicuous and legible from a long distance at freeway speeds, and easily understood. It must also be capable of being displayed by designated businesses on their facilities and on their private signing.

7. If a State provides separate signing, such as "Interstate Oasis Next Exit", advising road users of the availability of an Interstate Oasis at an interchange, should the business designated as an Interstate Oasis be disqualified from having business logos on Specific Service signs for gas, food, etc. at that interchange? Conversely, should the States have the flexibility to include the name and/or business logo of the designated business on the separate signing, such as "Interstate Oasis—Business Name/Logo—Next Exit"?

8. Assuming proper marketing and public education, will the name "Interstate Oasis" be readily understood by the public and identified with the type of service offered? Utah and Vermont use the names "Rest Stop" and "Rest Exit," respectively, for the types of facilities contemplated under the Interstate Oasis program. Would the Vermont or Utah names, or other names, better serve the public, and if so, what names are suggested and why?

9. What educational and marketing efforts would be necessary to familiarize travelers and businesses with this program?

Comments regarding the program and/or the questions listed above should clearly state the reasoning behind the responses. After receiving and considering comments submitted to the docket in response to this Notice, the FHWA may issue a policy memorandum detailing the Interstate Oasis program. The FHWA also may propose revising the MUTCD via the normal formal rulemaking process, to add pertinent standards, guidance, and options regarding Interstate Oasis signing in a future edition of the MUTCD.

Authority: Sec. 1305, Pub. L. 105–59, 119 Stat. 1144; 23 U.S.C. 109(d), 315, and 402; 23 CFR 1.32 and 655.603; and 49 CFR 1.48(b).

Issued on: February 16, 2006.

J. Richard Capka,

Acting Federal Highway Administrator.

[FR Doc. E6–2682 Filed 2–24–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA–2006–23669]

Notice of Request for Clearance of a New Information Collection: Commercial Driver's License Policies and Practices Among the 51 Jurisdictions

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

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces FMCSA's plan to submit the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for approval and comment. The ICR is related to Commercial Driver's License (CDL) policies and practices among the 50 States and the District of Columbia (referred to as the 51

jurisdictions). On October 26, 2005, the agency published a **Federal Register** notice with a 60-day comment period to solicit the public's views on the information collection pertaining to this subject. Ten comments were received.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before March 29, 2006. A comment to OMB is most effective if OMB receives it within 30 days of this publication.

ADDRESSES: Send 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: Ms. Glenda Davis, FMCSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Rm. 8304, Washington, DC 20590; phone: 202-366-5209; fax: 202-366-7298; e-mail:

glenda.davis@fmcsa.dot.gov or Lorena F. Truett, National Transportation Research Center, 2360 Cherahala Boulevard, Room I-32, Knoxville, TN 37932; phone: 865-946-1306; fax: 865-946-1314; e-mail: *TruettLF@ornl.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This package contains the following supplementary information:

Title: Commercial Driver's License Policies and Practices Among the 51 Jurisdictions.

OMB Control Number: 2126-XXXX.
Type of Request: New information collection.

Background: The Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act (CMVSA), (Pub. L. 99-570, Title XII, 100 Stat. 3207-170, October 27, 1998), was passed in an effort to improve highway safety as it related to commercial motor vehicle (CMV) drivers. The Commercial Driver's License Program was created as a result of the CMVSA. The Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 (MCSIA), (Pub. L. 106-159, 113 Stat. 1748, December 9, 1999), further strengthened the CDL Program through more vehicle and driver inspections and carrier compliance reviews, stronger enforcement, expedited completion of rules, and effective CDL testing, record keeping, and sanctions. The goal of both the CMVSA and MCSIA was to improve highway safety by ensuring that drivers of commercial motor vehicles were qualified to operate those vehicles and to remove unsafe and unqualified drivers from the highways.

FMCSA conducts Compliance Reviews (CRs) of the 50 States plus Washington, DC, to ensure that the States are complying with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations. Additional objectives of the State CRs include the following: Identifying technical, operational, and

administrative deficiencies in State CDL programs; establishing a mechanism for identifying and correcting serious program deficiencies; and identifying opportunities for CDL fraud.

Based on the results of the State CRs, which were completed in every State, some States had fewer compliance issues than others. It appears, however, that each State was in non-compliance to some degree at the time the CR was conducted in the State. FMCSA believes it is necessary to understand why the States are in non-compliance. While there is anecdotal evidence to suggest that fault may lie with the various processes used within the States, or the Agency's failure to provide adequate guidance, or even with the States' inability to understand the Federal regulations, there has been no systematic effort to determine the cause of non-compliance. For FMCSA to find a solution which brings the States into compliance with the CDL Federal requirements and thereby increase commercial-vehicle safety, FMCSA must obtain input from the States. No other survey of this type is being conducted.

The primary means for obtaining information from the State officials through this survey will be via a password-protected Web site. In the introduction ("welcome screen") to the questionnaire, the respondent will be provided alternatives for taking the survey via a paper copy or over a phone call with a contractor hired by FMCSA. If the respondent indicates a preference for the paper copy or phone survey, arrangements will be made for administering the survey in the desired format. In addition, any respondents who prefer to be interviewed via a phone call will also be provided an e-mail address so they may submit additional comments if desired.

Respondents: The total number of respondents is 51. Each of the 51 jurisdictions (50 States plus the District of Columbia) will be contacted.

Average Burden per Response: Each response is expected to take about 1 hour to complete.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: The estimated total annual burden is 51 hours (51 responses \times 1 hour per response = 51 hours).

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of FMCSA, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the

collection of information on respondents, without reducing the quality of the collected information. All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval.

Issued on: February 17, 2006.

Annette M. Sandberg,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. E6-2680 Filed 2-24-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-EX-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Reports, Forms, and Recordkeeping Requirements Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and the expected burden. The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period was published on December 5, 2005 (70 FR 72500-72501).

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before March 29, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Send comments, within 30 days, to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725-17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention NHTSA Desk Officer.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Siegler at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Office of Research and Technology (NTI-132), 202-366-3976, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Room 5119, Washington, DC 20590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Title: Evaluation Surveys for Impaired Driving and Safety Belt Interventions.

OMB Number: 2127-New.

Type of Request: New information collection requirement.

Abstract: The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration proposes to conduct a series of telephone surveys that will examine the effectiveness of multiple National and State Click It or Ticket mobilizations and impaired