

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.

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 "FMCSA-2014-0102" 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, self-addressed 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, To submit your comment online, go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and in the search box insert the docket number "FMCSA-2014-0102" 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

Donald Clupper

Mr. Clupper, 43, holds an operator's license in Delaware.

Andrew Deuschle

Mr. Deuschle, 44, holds an operator's license in Texas.

James Dignan

Mr. Dignan, 24, holds an operator's license in Illinois.

Timothy P. Gallagher

Mr. Gallagher, 51, holds an operator's license in Pennsylvania.

Joseph T. Kelly

Mr. Kelly, 27, holds an operator's license in Pennsylvania.

Timothy Laporte

Mr. Laporte, 26, holds an operator's license in Georgia.

James R. Lorshbaugh

Mr. Lorshbaugh, 43, holds an operator's license in Mississippi.

Douglas Mader

Mr. Mader, 45, holds an operator's license in Illinois.

Jose A. Martinez

Mr. Martinez, 51, holds a Class B commercial driver's license (CDL) in Texas.

Robert M. Mullens

Mr. Mullens, 33, holds a Class A commercial driver's license (CDL) in New Jersey.

Tim S. Oyler

Mr. Oyler, 46, holds a Class B commercial driver's license (CDL) in Utah.

Alfredo S. Ramirez

Mr. Ramirez, 43, holds a Class B commercial driver's license (CDL) in Texas.

Julie M. Ramirez

Ms. Ramirez, 42, holds an operator's license in Texas.

Tracy D. Robinson

Mr. Robinson, 48, holds an operator's license in California.

Linda L. Schmidt

Ms. Schmidt, 49, holds a Class A commercial driver's license (CDL) in Texas.

Kirk A. Soneson

Mr. Soneson, 48, holds an operator's license in Ohio.

Hayden A. Teesdale

Mr. Teesdale, 39, holds a Class A commercial driver's license (CDL) in Alabama.

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 June 23, 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: May 8, 2014.

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2014-11878 Filed 5-21-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-EX-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA-2014-0004]

Qualification of Drivers; Exemption Applications; Vision

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

ACTION: Notice of final disposition.

SUMMARY: FMCSA announces its decision to exempt 66 individuals from the vision requirement in the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs). They are unable to meet the vision requirement in one eye for various reasons. The exemptions will enable these individuals to operate commercial motor vehicles (CMVs) in interstate commerce without meeting the prescribed vision requirement in one eye. The Agency has concluded that granting these exemptions will provide a level of safety that is equivalent to or greater than the level of safety maintained without the exemptions for these CMV drivers.

DATES: The exemptions are effective May 22, 2014. The exemptions expire on May 23, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Elaine M. Papp, Chief, Medical Programs Division, (202)-366-4001, fmcamedical@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:

Electronic Access

You may see all the comments online through the Federal Document Management System (FDMS) at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

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., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The FDMS is available 24 hours each day, 365 days each year. If you want acknowledgement that we received your comments, please include a self-addressed, 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 Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) published in the **Federal Register** on January 17, 2008 (73 FR 3316).

Background

On April 1, 2014, FMCSA published a notice of receipt of exemption applications from certain individuals, and requested comments from the public (79 FR 18392). That notice listed 66 applicants' case histories. The 66 individuals applied for exemptions from the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10), for drivers who operate CMVs in interstate commerce.

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. Accordingly, FMCSA has evaluated the 66 applications on their merits and made a determination to grant exemptions to each of them.

Vision and Driving Experience of the Applicants

The vision requirement in the FMCSRs provides:

A person is physically qualified to drive a commercial motor vehicle 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 (49 CFR 391.41(b)(10)).

FMCSA recognizes that some drivers do not meet the vision requirement but have adapted their driving to accommodate their vision limitation and demonstrated their ability to drive safely. The 66 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, central scar, ocular histoplasmosis, prosthetic eye, corneal scar, strabismic amblyopia, corneal ulcer, lens opacity, macular scar, cataract, congenital amblyopia, optic nerve damage, complete loss of vision, macular lesion, corneal laceration, scar tissue, refractive amblyopia, aphakia, total retinal detachment, central corneal scarring, detached retina, keratoconus, enucleation, strabismus, exotropia, macular hole, epiretinal membrane, congenital retinal damage, coloboma, central retinal artery occlusion, congenital cataract, glaucoma, retinoschisis, and anisometropia. In most cases, their eye conditions were not recently developed. Forty-seven of the applicants were either born with their vision impairments or have had them since childhood.

The nineteen individuals that sustained their vision conditions as adults have had it for a period of 5 to 31 years.

Although each applicant has one eye which does not meet the vision requirement in 49 CFR 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 valid commercial driver's licenses (CDLs) or non-CDLs to operate CMVs. Before issuing CDLs, States subject drivers to knowledge and skills tests designed to evaluate their qualifications to operate a CMV.

All of these applicants satisfied the testing requirements for their State of residence. By meeting State licensing requirements, the applicants demonstrated their ability to operate a CMV, with their limited vision, to the satisfaction of the State.

While possessing a valid CDL or non-CDL, these 66 drivers have been authorized to drive a CMV in intrastate commerce, even though their vision disqualified them from driving in interstate commerce. They have driven CMVs with their limited vision in careers ranging from 1 to 55 years. In the past 3 years, two of the drivers were involved in crashes and five were convicted for moving violations in a CMV.

The qualifications, experience, and medical condition of each applicant were stated and discussed in detail in the April 1, 2014 notice (79 FR 18392).

Basis for Exemption Determination

Under 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, FMCSA may grant an exemption from the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10) if the exemption is likely to achieve an equivalent or greater level of safety than would be achieved without the exemption. Without the exemption, applicants will continue to be restricted to intrastate driving. With the exemption, applicants can drive in interstate commerce. Thus, our analysis focuses on whether an equal or greater level of safety is likely to be achieved by permitting each of these drivers to drive in interstate commerce as opposed to restricting him or her to driving in intrastate commerce.

To evaluate the effect of these exemptions on safety, FMCSA considered the medical reports about the applicants' vision as well as their driving records and experience with the vision deficiency.

To qualify for an exemption from the vision requirement, FMCSA requires a person to present verifiable evidence that he/she has driven a commercial vehicle safely with the vision deficiency for the past 3 years. Recent driving performance is especially important in evaluating future safety, according to several research studies designed to correlate past and future driving performance. Results of these studies support the principle that the best predictor of future performance by a driver is his/her past record of crashes and traffic violations. Copies of the studies may be found at Docket Number FMCSA-1998-3637.

FMCSA believes it can properly apply the principle to monocular drivers, because data from the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) former waiver study program clearly demonstrate the driving performance of experienced monocular drivers in the program is better than that of all CMV drivers collectively (See 61 FR 13338, 13345, March 26, 1996). The fact that experienced monocular drivers

demonstrated safe driving records in the waiver program supports a conclusion that other monocular drivers, meeting the same qualifying conditions as those required by the waiver program, are also likely to have adapted to their vision deficiency and will continue to operate safely.

The first major research correlating past and future performance was done in England by Greenwood and Yule in 1920. Subsequent studies, building on that model, concluded that crash rates for the same individual exposed to certain risks for two different time periods vary only slightly (See Bates and Neyman, University of California Publications in Statistics, April 1952). Other studies demonstrated theories of predicting crash proneness from crash history coupled with other factors. These factors—such as age, sex, geographic location, mileage driven and conviction history—are used every day by insurance companies and motor vehicle bureaus to predict the probability of an individual experiencing future crashes (See Weber, Donald C., “Accident Rate Potential: An Application of Multiple Regression Analysis of a Poisson Process,” *Journal of 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 66 applicants, two of the drivers were involved in crashes and five were convicted of moving violations in a CMV. All the applicants achieved a 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 requirement 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 66 applicants listed in the notice of April 1, 2014 (79 FR 18392).

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 66 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 requirement 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 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 three comments in this proceeding. The comments are discussed below.

Simon Batter and Robert Turley are in favor of granting Blaine R. Dickman an exemption from the vision standard.

Kenneth Stewart is in favor of granting George E. Lewis and exemption from the vision standard.

Conclusion

Based upon its evaluation of the 66 exemption applications, FMCSA exempts Britton J. Anderson (KS), Rodney R. Anderson (PA), Kenneth R. Anselm (KY), James E. Baker (OH), Alphonso A. Barco (SC), Aaron D. Barnett (IA), Daniel W. Bobb (PA), Anatoliy A. Bogdanets (OR), Stanley R. Cap (SD), Louis Castro (MT), David F. Cialdea (MA), Bobby E. Collins (NC), Michael T. Craddock (CA), Eric C. Dettrey (NJ), Dean E. Dexter (SD), Blaine R. Dickman (NV), David C. Dockery (CA), Timothy C. Dotson (MO), Barent H. Eliason (MO), Peter D. J. Ensor (MD), Paul W. Fettig (SD), Roger L. Frazier (NC), Joey W. Freeman (AR), Kevin L. Fritz (IL), Grant G. Gibson (MN), Danny J. Goss (MO), Todd C. Grider (IN), James P. Griffin (WA), Dennis P. Hart (OR), Kyle C. Holschlag (IA), Michael T. Huso (MN), Earl E. Kennedy III (PA), James D. Kessler (SD), Eric W. Kopmann (MO), Robin D. Kurtz (CT), Sherell J. Landry (TX), George E. Lewis (OH), Ronald N. Lindgren (MN), James L. Maddox (GA), Robert P. Malarkey, Sr. (NY), Michael L. Manning (MO), Philip D. Mathys (OH), Rodney J. McMorran (IA), Johnny L. Meese (MO), Corey L. Morman (FL), Jaime P. Narte, Jr. (WA), James M. Nohl (MN), Thomas G. Ohlson (NY), Jason S. Otto (KY), Nathan J. Price (ID), Robert D. Reeder (MI), Ricky L. Rice (PA), Johnnie K. Richard (LA), Jorge L. Y. Rivera (CA), Craig Robinson (FL), Michael E. Schlachter (WY), Kenneth W. Sigl (WI), Robert A. Simpson (MS), Jeffrey L. Singley (MD), Dennis Torrence (WI), Julie J. Walsh (ND), Michael T. Wimber (MT), Elmer F. Winters (NC), Theodore R. Wolden (MN), Eugene T. Wolf (IA), and Duane R. Yoder (IN) 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.

Issued on: May 8, 2014.

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2014–11883 Filed 5–21–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2014–0045; Notice 1]

General Motors, LLC, Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Receipt of Petition.

SUMMARY: General Motors, LLC, “GM” has determined that certain model year (MY) 2014 GMC Sierra Denali vehicles do not fully comply with paragraph S3.1.4.1 of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 102, *Transmission Shift Position Sequence, Starter Interlock, and Transmission Braking Effect*. GM has filed an appropriate report dated January 31, 2014 pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports*.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the petition is June 23, 2014.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on this petition. Comments must refer to the docket and notice number cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted by any of the following methods:

- *Mail:* Send comments by mail addressed to: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.

- *Hand Deliver:* Deliver comments by hand to: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. except Federal Holidays.

- *Electronically:* Submit comments electronically by: logging onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Web site at <http://www.regulations.gov/>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Comments may also be faxed to (202) 493–2251.

Comments must be written in the English language, and be no greater than 15 pages in length, although there is no limit to the length of necessary attachments to the comments. If comments are submitted in hard copy form, please ensure that two copies are provided. If you wish to receive confirmation that your comments were received, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard with the comments. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided.

Documents submitted to a docket may be viewed by anyone at the address and times given above. The documents may also be viewed on the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov> by following the online instructions for accessing the dockets. DOT’s complete Privacy Act Statement is available for review in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000, (65 FR 19477–78).

The petition, supporting materials, and all comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated below will be filed and will be considered. All comments and supporting materials received after the closing date will also be filed and will be considered to the extent possible. When the petition is granted or denied, notice of the decision will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. GM’s Petition

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) (see implementing rule at 49 CFR part 556), GM submitted a petition for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

This notice of receipt of GM’s petition is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the petition.

II. Vehicles Involved

Affected are approximately 2,747 MY 2014 GMC Sierra Denali vehicles equipped with RPO code “UHS” instrument cluster displays that were manufactured between July 16, 2013 and January 27, 2014.

III. Noncompliance

GM explains that while the subject vehicles are being driven the gear shift selection indicator (a.k.a., PRNDM) may not be visible for approximately 1.3 seconds during an instrument cluster

reset, thus, failing to fully meet the requirements set forth in paragraph S3.1.4.1 of FMVSS No. 102.

IV. Rule Text

Paragraph S3.1.4.1 of FMVSS No. 102 requires:

S3.1.4.1 Except as specified in S3.1.4.3, if the transmission shift position sequence includes a park position, identification of shift positions, including the position in relation to each other and the position selected, shall be displayed in view of the driver whenever any of the following exist:

- (a) The ignition is in a position where the transmission can be shifted; or
- (b) The transmission is not in park.

V. Summary of GM’s Analyses

GM stated its belief that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety for the following reasons:

1. GM believes that the condition is extremely unlikely to occur. For the condition to occur, the instrument cluster design input rate must be exceeded. This can only happen under extreme load conditions. For example, GM was able to create the condition in the laboratory by simultaneously inputting a series of warnings into the cluster during an active search of a media device connected to the vehicle while a Bluetooth call is received by the vehicle.

2. GM states that any disruption of the PRNDM display as a result of this condition is very brief. In the unlikely event the condition were to occur and the instrument cluster resets, the PRNDM display would be restored within 1.3 seconds. This momentary reset would be a clear indication to the driver that service may be required.

3. GM also believes that the condition has little effect on the normal operation of the vehicle. While the operation of the instrument panel is briefly affected by the underlying condition, none of the other vehicle operations are affected.

4. GM states that the condition is extremely remote and not likely to occur during shifting. Considering the unusual combination of pre-conditions for the condition to occur, it is very unlikely the brief disruption of the PRNDM display would occur when it is needed, i.e., during shifting. Most shifting occurs shortly after the vehicle is started, or just prior to being turned off. In the rare instance of a cluster reset, it would be more likely to occur during driving, not immediately after starting the vehicle or just prior to the driver exiting the vehicle.

5. GM is not aware of any reported instrument cluster resets as a result of the subject noncompliance.