
As of January 28, 2016, the following 9 individuals have satisfied the conditions for obtaining a renewed exemption from the vision requirements (74 FR 60022; 75 FR 4623; 77 FR 543; 78 FR 76707; 80 FR 80443):

- James J. Coffield (NM)
- Roy E. Crayne (WA)
- James A. Dubay (MI)
- Donald E. Halvorson (NM)
- Roger D. Kool (IA)
- Phillip J.C. Locke (CO)
- Brian T. Nelson (MN)
- Christopher M. Rivera (NM)
- Robert E. Whitney (IL)

The drivers were included in one of the following dockets: Docket No. FMCSA–2009–0303. Their exemptions are effective as of January 28, 2016 and will expire on January 29, 2018.

As of January 29, 2016, the following 21 individuals have satisfied the conditions for obtaining a renewed exemption from the vision requirements (78 FR 67454; 79 FR 4803; 80 FR 80443):

- Calvin J. Barbour (NY)
- Martin D. Bellcour (WI)
- Walter A. Breeze (OH)
- Donald G. Carstensen (IA)
- Jamie D. Daniels (IA)
- Mark A. Farnsley (IN)
- Michael L. Flamingo (PA)
- Kenric J. Fields (DE)
- Randall Hielbel HMI (MN)
- Randy C. Kinney (IL)
- Hector Marquez (TX)
- Dennis R. Martinez (NM)
- Fred A. Miller, Jr. (CA)
- Joseph K. Parley (WI)
- Robert L. Pearson (GA)
- Ryan R. Ross (SC)
- Troy M. Ruhman (PA)
- Hershel D. Volentine (LA)
- Gary D. Vollertsen (CO)
- David R. Webb, Jr. (IL)
- Wesley A. Willis (NJ)

The drivers were included in one of the following dockets: Docket No. FMCSA–2013–0170. Their exemptions are effective as of January 29, 2016 and will expire on January 29, 2018.

Each of these 120 applicants has requested renewal of the exemption and has submitted evidence showing that the vision in the better eye continues to meet the requirement 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 two years indicates each applicant continues to meet the vision exemption requirements.

These factors provide an adequate basis for predicting each driver’s ability to continue to drive safely in interstate commerce. Therefore, FMCSA concludes that extending the exemption for each renewal applicant for a period of two years is likely to achieve a level of safety equal to that existing without the exemption.

V. Conditions and Requirements

The exemptions are extended subject to the following conditions: (1) That each individual has a physical examination every year (a) by an ophthalmologist or optometrist who attests that the vision in the better eye continues to meet the requirements 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 provides 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 retains a copy of the certification on his/her person while driving for presentation to a duly authorized Federal, State, or local enforcement official.

VI. Conclusion

Based upon its evaluation of the 120 exemption applications, FMCSA renews the exemptions of the aforementioned drivers 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 31135, 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: June 7, 2016.

Larry W. Minor, Associate Administrator for Policy.
They are unable to meet the vision requirement in one eye for various reasons, including amblyopia, anisometropic amblyopia, central retinal scar, choroidal melanoma, complete loss of vision, corneal scarring, macular scar, prosthetic eye, pseudophakia, ptosis bulbi, refractive amblyopia, retinal detachment, temporal hemianopia, and traumatic glaucoma. In most cases, their eye conditions were not recently developed. Twenty-one of the applicants were either born with their vision impairments or have had them since childhood.

The 9 individuals that sustained their vision conditions as adults have had it for a range of 4 to 46 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 30 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 for 4 to 53 years. In the past three years, no drivers were involved in crashes, and 2 drivers were convicted of moving violations in CMVs.

The qualifications, experience, and medical condition of each applicant were stated and discussed in detail in the March 16, 2016 notice (81 FR 14190).

IV. 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,
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 30 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, 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.

V. Discussion of Comments

FMCSA received no comments in this proceeding.

IV. Conclusion

Based upon its evaluation of the 30 exemption applications, FMCSA exempts the following drivers from the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10), subject to the requirements cited above (49 CFR 391.64(b)):

Gary L. Bartels (TX)
Christopher Benavidez (NM)
William H. Brene (SD)
Dean B. Carrick (MI)
Jaime V. Cavazos (TX)
Jacob Dehoyos (MO)
Larry D. Fulk (MO)
Hugo A. Galvis Barrera (GA)
Harold J. Gilbert (CO)
Darrell K. Harber (MO)
Clair G. High (PA)
Robert E. Holbrook (TN)
Lowell E. Jackson (MO)
Maurice L. Kinney (NY)
Richard P. Krafczynski, Jr. (PA)
Michael S. McHale (PA)
Darin P. Milton (TN)
Myron C. Thompson (MN)
Dakota J. Papsun (PA)
Raffaele Petrillo (NJ)

William J. Powell (KY)
Cory R. Rand (NH)
Bobby W. Sanders (TN)
Logan D. Shaffer (SC)
Laurence W. Sellers (AL)
Johnny T. Solorio (CA)
Richard R. Vonderohe (IA)
William J. Watts (MT)
Russell Zelich (PA)
Frederick A. Zoeller, Jr. (NH)

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: June 6, 2016.
Larry W. Minor,
Associate Administrator for Policy.
[FR Doc. 2016–14140 Filed 6–14–16; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

Petition for Approval of Product Safety Plan

In accordance with part 211 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this document provides the public notice that by a document dated May 12, 2016, CSX Transportation (CSX) has petitioned the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) for approval of its Product Safety Plan (PSP) for its ElectroBlox Wayside Interface Unit (WIU). FRA assigned the petition Docket Number FRA–2010–0028.

The PSP submitted is intended to meet the requirements prescribed in 49 CFR part 236, subpart H–Standards for Processor-Based Signal and Train Control Systems, in 49 CFR 236.907 and 49 CFR 236.913. As such, CSX maintains that the ElectroBlox system was designed in a safe manner, reliably executes the functions of an interoperable Positive Train Control (PTC) wayside component, and does not result in risk that exceeds the previous condition.

The ElectroBlox system is used to translate discrete vital inputs into wayside status messages that comply with the Interoperable Train Control