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 16 applicants have had ITDM over a range of 1 to 44 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 March 27, 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 16 exemption applications, FMCSA exempts, Ross J. Brown (MI), Bert R. Duncan, Jr. (UT), John L. Frank (ID), DeVere E. Hansen (UT), Grant C. Huftalin, (IA), Steven M. Janczak (WI), Aaron L. Kreiser (MD), Mark S. Madsen (NE), James W. McClintock, III (AR), John W. Morrison (CA), Bruce V. Oppegard (MN), Edward L. Quinones, (IL), David L. Rice (ME), Wade D. Street (MT), Charles M. Sweat (VA) and Donald E. Towne (CT) 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 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: May 9, 2012.

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2012–11911 Filed 5–16–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA–1999–5748; FMCSA–1999–6480; FMCSA–2000–7006; FMCSA–2000–7363; FMCSA–2004–17195; FMCSA–2005–21254; FMCSA–2006–23773; FMCSA–2010–0050]

Qualification of Drivers; Exemption Applications; Vision

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

ACTION: Notice of renewal of exemptions; request for comments.

SUMMARY: FMCSA announces its decision to renew the exemptions from the vision requirement in the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations for 18 individuals. FMCSA has statutory authority to exempt individuals from the vision requirement if the exemptions granted will not compromise safety. The Agency has concluded that granting these exemption renewals will provide a level of safety that is equivalent to or greater than the level of safety maintained without the exemptions for these commercial motor vehicle (CMV) drivers.

DATES: This decision is effective June 3, 2012. Comments must be received on or before June 18, 2012.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments bearing the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) numbers: FMCSA–1999–5748; FMCSA–1999–6480; FMCSA–2000–7006; FMCSA–2000–7363; FMCSA–2004–17195; FMCSA–2005–21254; FMCSA–2006–23773;

FMCSA–2010–0050, using any of the following methods:

• *Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

• Mail: Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590–0001.

• Hand Delivery or Courier: West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

• Fax: 1–202–493–2251.

Instructions: Each submission must include the Agency name and the docket number for this notice. Note that DOT posts all comments received without change to *http://www.regulations.gov*, including any personal information included in a comment. Please see the Privacy Act heading below.

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 Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) is available 24 hours each day, 365 days each year. If you want acknowledgment 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 FDMS published in the **Federal Register** on January 17, 2008 (73 FR 3316), or you may visit *http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2008/pdf/E8–785.pdf.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Elaine M. Papp, Chief, Medical Programs Division, 202–366–4001, *fmcsamedical@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:

Background

Under 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, FMCSA may renew an exemption from the vision requirements in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10), which applies to drivers of CMVs in interstate commerce, for a two-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 procedures for requesting an exemption (including renewals) are set out in 49 CFR part 381.

Exemption Decision

This notice addresses 18 individuals who have requested renewal of their exemptions in accordance with FMCSA procedures. FMCSA has evaluated these 18 applications for renewal on their merits and decided to extend each exemption for a renewable two-year period. They are:

Dean R. Allen (OR)
James C. Askin (FL)
Ernie E. Black (NC)
Gary O. Brady (WV)
Stephen H. Goldcamp (OH)
Hazel L. Hopkins, Jr. (MD)
Wai F. King (IL)
Dennis E. Krone (IL)
Richard J. McKenzie, Jr. (MD)
Christopher J. Meerten (OR)
Craig W. Miller, (MO)
Robert J. Mohorter (NY)
James A.Mohr (MT)
Tommy L. Ray, Jr. (AL)
George S. Rayson (OH)
Kevin L. Routin (KY)
Lane L. Savoie (LA)
Raul R. Torres (CA)

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. Each exemption will be valid for two years unless rescinded earlier by 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. 31136(e) and 31315.

Basis for Renewing Exemptions

Under 49 U.S.C. 31315(b)(1), an exemption may be granted for no longer than two years from its approval date and may be renewed upon application for additional two year periods. In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, each of the 18 applicants has satisfied the entry conditions for obtaining an exemption from the vision requirements (64 FR 27027; 64 FR 51568; 64 FR 68195; 65 FR 20245; 65 FR 20251; 65 FR 45817; 65 FR 57230; 65 FR 77066; 66 FR 63289; 67 FR 17102; 67 FR 38311; 68 FR 1654; 69 FR 8260; 69 FR 17263; 69 FR 17267; 69 FR 26921; 69 FR 31447; 70 FR 7545; 70 FR 30999; 70 FR 46567; 71 FR 6826; 71 FR 16410; 71 FR 16902; 71 FR 27033; 72 FR 40359; 73 FR 11989; 73 FR 28186; 75 FR 14656; 75 FR19674; 75 FR 27623; 75 FR 28682). Each of these 18 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.

Request for Comments

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. 31136(e) and 31315. However, FMCSA requests that interested parties with specific data concerning the safety records of these drivers submit comments by June 18, 2012.

FMCSA believes that the requirements for a renewal of an exemption under 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and

31315 can be satisfied by initially granting the renewal and then requesting and evaluating, if needed, subsequent comments submitted by interested parties. As indicated above, the Agency previously published notices of final disposition announcing its decision to exempt these 18 individuals from the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). The final decision to grant an exemption to each of these individuals was made on the merits of each case and made only after careful consideration of the comments received to its notices of applications. The notices of applications stated in detail the qualifications, experience, and medical condition of each applicant for an exemption from the vision requirements. That information is available by consulting the above cited **Federal Register** publications.

Interested parties or organizations possessing information that would otherwise show that any, or all, of these drivers are not currently achieving the statutory level of safety should immediately notify FMCSA. The Agency will evaluate any adverse evidence submitted and, if safety is being compromised or if continuation of the exemption would not be consistent with the goals and objectives of 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, FMCSA will take immediate steps to revoke the exemption of a driver.

Issued on: May 9, 2012.

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2012–11912 Filed 5–16–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2011–0058; Notice 3]

Toyota Motor Corporation, Inc., Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Grant of Petition.

SUMMARY: Toyota Motor North America, Inc., on behalf of Toyota Motor Corporation,[1] and Toyota Manufacturing, Indiana, Inc.[2] (collectively referred to as ''Toyota''), has determined that certain model year 2011 Toyota Sienna multipurpose passenger vehicles (MPV) manufactured between January 3, 2011 and February 11, 2011, do not fully comply with paragraph S9.5(a)(3) of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 225, *Child restraint anchorage systems.* Toyota filed an appropriate report dated March 17, 2011, pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573 *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports.*

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) and the rule implementing those provisions at 49 CFR Part 556, Toyota has petitioned 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. Notice of receipt of the petition was published, with a 30-day public comment period, on June 16, 2011 in the **Federal Register** (76 FR 35271). No comments were received. To view the petition and all supporting documents log onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Web site at: *http://www.regulations.gov/.* Then follow the online search instructions to locate docket number ''NHTSA–2011–0058.''

For further information on this decision contact Mr. Ed Chan, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), telephone (202) 493–0335, facsimile (202) 366–7002.

Vehicles involved: Affected are approximately 9,122 model year 2011 Toyota Sienna MPV's that were manufactured between January 3, 2011 and February 11, 2011.

Noncompliance: Toyota explains that the noncompliance is that the label identifying the location of the lower child restraint anchorages in some of the second row seats of the affected vehicles are located slightly outside the limits as stated within the requirements of paragraph S9.5(a)(3) of FMVSS No. 225.

Specifically, Toyota also explains that ''the potential deviation of the label location outside the requirement is very small. Toyota observed that in a detailed survey of a randomly selected subset involving 18 of these vehicles in which it found a deviation, the mean deviation was approximately +1.4 mm (i.e. 26.4 mm from the centerline); the maximum deviation observed was +2.5 mm (i.e. 27.5 mm from the centerline); and the standard deviation was only 0.5 mm. While a survey carried out by the seat supplier also supports Toyota's assertions that the potential deviation of the label location from the specified requirements is very small. In the supplier's survey of 240 labels on 120 seats, 3 labels were outside of the specifications of FMVSS No. 225. All 3 of those labels were measured at +1 mm beyond the specification, or 26 mm from the centerline.''

Summary of Toyota's Analysis and Arguments

Toyota stated its belief that although the lower child anchorage labels are outside the specified limits of this requirement that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety for the following reasons:

(1) The measured deviations are very minor, and such a slight deviation is not noticeable to consumers and would not impair a consumer's ability to locate the lower anchorages.

(2) Paragraph S9.1 of FMVSS No. 225 requires that the length of the straight portion of the lower anchorage bar be a minimum of 25 mm. In the affected vehicles the length is 30 mm; the total length including the curved portions is 54 mm. As a result, even with greater deviations than noted above in label location, some part of the label would be over some part of the bar, making the bar easy to locate.

(3) The regulatory history of the provision allowing a ±25 mm lateral tolerance for the location of the center of the circular label further supports the argument that this noncompliance has no adverse safety consequences. As originally adopted, FMVSS No. 225 would have limited the lateral tolerance to ±12 mm. In response to a petition for reconsideration from vehicle manufacturers concerned that such a low tolerance would be difficult to meet due to process limitations and seat design features, NHTSA amended the standard to allow the current ±25 mm tolerance. 69 Fed Reg. 48818 (August 11, 2004). In doing so, The agency stated:

''* * * Moreover, the agency believes that increasing the tolerance to 25 mm will not significantly affect the consumers' ability to find the LATCH anchorages. While anchor bars are permitted to be as short as 25 mm in the straight portion of the bar, most are considerably longer. Even if a 25 mm bar were used, with a 25 mm tolerance from the center of the bar, the circle will be, at farthest, tangent to a longitudinal vertical plane tangent to the side of the anchorage bar. If a person were to probe the seat bight in the area directly under the marking circle, his or her finger would easily contact the bar. For bars that are greater than 25 mm in length, with a 25 mm tolerance a portion of the marking circle will always be over some part of the bar. In either situation, marking the circle with a 25 mm tolerance will adequately provide a visual reminder to consumers that the LATCH system is present and will help users locate and use the bars. Adopting the 25 mm tolerance will also

[1] Toyota Motor Corporation is a Japanese corporation that manufacturers and imports motor vehicles.

[2] Toyota Manufacturing, Indiana, Inc., is an Indiana corporation that manufactures motor vehicles.