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Background

On June 6, 2012, FMCSA published a notice of receipt of Federal diabetes exemption applications from 23 individuals and requested comments from the public (77 FR 33551). The public comment period closed on July 6, 2012, and no comments were received. FMCSA has evaluated the eligibility of the 23 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 the current regulation 49 CFR 391.41(b)(3).

Diabetes Mellitus and Driving Experience of the Applicants

The Agency established the current requirement for diabetes in 1970 because several risk studies indicated that drivers with diabetes had a higher rate of crash involvement than the general population. The diabetes rule provides that “A person is physically qualified to drive a commercial motor vehicle if that person has no established medical history or clinical diagnosis of diabetes mellitus currently requiring insulin for control” (49 CFR 391.41(b)(3)).

FMCSA established its diabetes exemption program, based on the Agency’s July 2000 study entitled “A Report to Congress on the Feasibility of a Program to Qualify Individuals with Insulin-Treated Diabetes Mellitus to Operate in Interstate Commerce as Directed by the Transportation Act for the 21st Century.” The report concluded that a safe and practicable protocol to allow some drivers with ITDM to operate CMVs is feasible. The September 3, 2003 (68 FR 52441), Federal Register notice in conjunction with the November 8, 2005 (70 FR 67777). Federal Register notice provides the current protocol for allowing such drivers to operate CMVs in interstate commerce.

These 23 applicants have had ITDM over a range of 1 to 40 years. These applicants report no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness or seizure, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning symptoms, in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the past 5 years. In each case, an endocrinologist verified that the driver has demonstrated a willingness to properly monitor and manage his/her diabetes mellitus, received education related to diabetes management, and is on a stable insulin regimen. These drivers report no other disqualifying conditions, including diabetes-related complications. Each meets the vision requirement at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). The qualifications and medical condition of each applicant were stated and discussed in detail in the June 6, 2012, Federal Register notice and they will not be repeated in this notice.

Discussion of Comments

FMCSA did not receive any comments in this proceeding.

Basis for Exemption Determination

Under 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, FMCSA may grant an exemption from the diabetes requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(3) if the exemption is likely to achieve an equivalent or greater level of safety than would be achieved without the exemption. The exemption allows the applicants to operate CMVs in interstate commerce.

To evaluate the effect of these exemptions on safety, FMCSA considered medical reports about the applicants’ ITDM and vision, and reviewed the treating endocrinologists’ medical opinion related to the ability of the driver to safely operate a CMV while using insulin.

Consequently, FMCSA finds that in each case exempting these applicants from the diabetes requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(3) is likely to achieve a level of safety equal to that existing without the exemption.

Conditions and Requirements

The terms and conditions of the exemption will be provided to the applicants in the exemption document.
and they include the following: (1) That each individual submit a quarterly monitoring checklist completed by the treating endocrinologist as well as an annual checklist with a comprehensive medical evaluation; (2) that each individual reports within 2 business days of occurrence, all episodes of severe hypoglycemia, significant complications, or inability to manage diabetes; also, any involvement in an accident or any other adverse event in a CMV or personal vehicle, whether or not it is related to an episode of hypoglycemia; (3) 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 (4) 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 also have a copy of the certification when driving, for presentation to a duly authorized Federal, State, or local enforcement official.

Conclusion

Based upon its evaluation of the 23 exemption applications, FMCSA exempts, Larry J. Anderson (MN), Kevin J. Blue (IL), Wade D. Calvin (WA), Carl A. Candelaria (NM), Owen R. Dossett (MS), David K. Dylak (IL), Jennifer A. Ferguson (SC), Michael E. Fritz (MN), Jason W. Griffith (KS), Lee A. Haerterich (WI), Eric W. Holland (CO), Richard P. Holmen (MN), Edward Jones (NJ), Paul A. Lacinia (ND), Robert L. Lawson (SC), Richard N. Listro (FL), Bradley J. Moore (MO), Jeremy T. Newton (MO), Ross W. Petermann (MN), James W. Pickard, Jr. (CO), Robert G. Shano (NY), Randall J. Tatum (MA), and Curtis J. Young (FL) from the ITDM requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(3), subject to the conditions listed under “Conditions and Requirements” above.

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315 each exemption will be valid for two years unless revoked earlier by FMCSA. The exemption will be revoked if the following occurs: (1) The person fails to comply with the terms and conditions of the 1/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(e) 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: July 18, 2012.
Larry W. Minor,
Associate Administrator for Policy.
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Notice of Availability of a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the California High-Speed Train Project Fresno to Bakersfield Section

AGENCY: Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), United States Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of Availability.

SUMMARY: FRA is issuing this notice to advise the public that a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has been prepared for the Fresno to Bakersfield Section of the California High-Speed Train (HST) Project (Project). FRA is the lead Federal agency and the California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) is the lead state agency for the environmental review process. The Supplemental Draft EIS was prepared by FRA and the Authority to meet the federal requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and to serve as the Authority’s Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in compliance with the state law requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is a Cooperating Agency for the Supplemental Draft EIS.

DATES: Written comments on the Supplemental Draft EIS for Fresno to Bakersfield Section should be provided to the Authority at the address listed below on or before September 20, 2012. Public hearings are scheduled on August 27, August 28, and August 29, 2012, at the times and dates listed in the Addresses Section below in Fresno, Hanford, and Bakersfield, CA.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on the Supplemental Draft EIS should be sent to the California High-Speed Rail Authority, EIR/EIS Comments, 770 L Street, Suite 800, Sacramento, CA 95814, or may be submitted online at Fresno_Bakersfield@hsr.ca.gov. Comments may also be provided orally or in writing at the public hearings scheduled at the following times and locations:

Fresno, CA, Wednesday, August 29, 2012, 3:00 to 8:00 p.m., Fresno Convention Center, Exhibit Hall III, 848 M Street, Fresno, CA;

Hanford, CA, Tuesday, August 28, 2012, 3:00 to 8:00 p.m., Hanford Fraternal Hall, 1015 N. 10th Avenue, Hanford, CA; and

Bakersfield, CA, Monday, August 27, 2012, 3:00 to 8:00 p.m., Beale Memorial Library, 701 Truxton Avenue, Bakersfield, CA.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The proposed California HST system would provide intercity, high-speed passenger rail service on more than 800 miles of tracks throughout California, connecting the major population centers of Sacramento, the San Francisco Bay Area, the Central Valley, Los Angeles, the Inland Empire, Orange County, and San Diego. It will use state-of-the-art, electrically powered, high-speed steel-wheel-on-steel-rail technology, including contemporary safety, signaling, and automated train-control systems, with trains capable of operating up to 220 miles per hour (mph) over a fully graded-separated, dedicated double track alignment. The HST System is comprised of multiple sections, one of which is the Fresno to Bakersfield Section analyzed in the Supplemental Draft EIS.

This project-level EIS tiers off of the Statewide Program EIR/EIS published by the Authority and the FRA in 2005 and builds off of subsequent decisions. The Fresno to Bakersfield Section is comprised of a 114-mile dedicated, double-track high-speed passenger rail corridor between Fresno and Bakersfield, CA. The Project includes proposed stations in downtown Fresno and Bakersfield, and a possible Kings/ Tulare Regional Station in the vicinity of Hanford, CA. A heavy maintenance facility for assembly, testing, and commissioning of trains, train inspection and service, and train overhaul may be constructed in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section.

In August 2011, FRA issued a Draft EIS and circulated the document for a 60-day public and agency review and comment period. The Draft EIS analyzed a no action alternative and various action alternatives for the construction and operation of the California HST Project Fresno to Bakersfield Section, including alignment alternatives and station locations. FRA and Authority held three public hearings on the Draft