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 28 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 26, 2013, **Federal Register** notice and they will not be repeated in this notice.

Discussion of Comments

FMCSA received two comments in this proceeding. The comments are considered and discussed below.

Laurie Susan Palmer expressed concern regarding the new A1C testing regulations.

John D. Heffington requested information regarding the new A1C testing regulations.

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 Tyler A. Benjamin (AL), Larry K. Brindle (KS), James D. Damske (MA), Manuel M. Fabela, Jr. (CA), Ryan L. Guffey (IL), Richard B. Harvey (CA), Donald F. Kurzejewski (PA), Joshua O. Lilly (VA), Steven C. Lundberg (IA), Frank D. Marcou, Jr. (VT), Roger D. Mott (IA), Bernard K. Nixon (FL), Thomas P. Olson (WI), Steven T. Vanderburg (NC), John P. Washington (NJ), and Christopher J. Wisner (MD) 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: September 20, 2013.

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2013–23766 Filed 9–27–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

Federal Highway Administration

[Docket No. FTA–2013–0029]

Proposed Policy Guidance on Metropolitan Planning Organization Representation

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Proposed policy guidance; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The FTA and FHWA are jointly issuing this proposed guidance on implementation of provisions of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21), Public Law 112–141, that require representation by providers of public transportation in each metropolitan planning organization (MPO) that serves a transportation management area (TMA) no later than October 1, 2014. The purpose of this guidance is to assist MPOs and providers of public transportation in complying with this new requirement.

DATES: Comments must be received by October 30, 2013. Any comments

received beyond this deadline will be considered to the extent practicable.

ADDRESSES: *Comments.* You may submit comments identified by the docket number (FTA–2013–0029) by any of the following methods:

Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

DOT Electronic Docket: Go to *http://dms.dot.gov* and follow the instructions for submitting comments.

U.S. Mail: Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590.

Hand Delivery or Courier: Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, Southeast, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.

Fax: 202–493–2251.

Instructions: You must include the agency names (Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration) and docket number (FTA–2013–0029) for this notice at the beginning of your comments. You must submit two copies of your comments if you submit them by mail. If you wish to receive confirmation that FTA and FHWA received your comments, you must include a self-addressed, stamped postcard. Due to security procedures in effect since October 2001, mail received through the U.S. Postal Service may be subject to delays. Parties submitting comments may wish to consider using an express mail firm to ensure prompt filing of any submissions not filed electronically or by hand. All comments received will be posted, without change and including any personal information provided, to *http://www.regulations.gov,* where they will be available to Internet users. You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement published in the **Federal Register** on April 11, 2000, at 65 FR 19477. For access to the docket to read background documents and comments received, go to *http://www.regulations.gov* at any time, or to the Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dwayne Weeks, FTA Office of Planning and Environment, telephone (202) 366–4033 or *Dwayne.Weeks@dot.gov;* or Harlan Miller, FHWA Office of Planning, telephone (202) 366–0847 or *Harlan.Miller@dot.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. *Introduction*

The FTA and FHWA are jointly issuing this proposed policy guidance on the implementation of 23 U.S.C. 134(d)(2)(B) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(d)(2)(B), which require representation by providers of public transportation in each MPO that serves an area designated as a TMA. The FTA and FHWA anticipate issuing a joint notice of proposed rulemaking to amend 23 CFR part 450 to implement 23 U.S.C. 134(d)(2)(B) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(d)(2)(B) as amended by sections 1201 and 20005 of MAP–21. These United States Code sections now require representation by providers of public transportation in each MPO that serves an area designated as a TMA. A TMA is defined as an urbanized area with a population of over 200,000 individuals as determined by the 2010 census, or an urbanized area with a population of fewer than 200,000 individuals that is designated as a TMA by the request of the Governor and the MPO designated for the area.[1] As of the date of this guidance, of the 384 MPOs throughout the Nation, 184 MPOs serve an area designated as a TMA.

The FTA conducted an On-Line Dialogue on this requirement from March 5 through March 29, 2013. Through this forum, FTA received input from MPOs, local elected officials, transit agencies, and the general public, with over 3,000 visits to the Web site. Over 100 ideas were submitted from 340 registered users who also provided hundreds of comments and votes on these ideas. Participants discussed the complex nature of MPOs and the advantages of providing flexibility for MPOs and transit providers to decide locally how to include representation by providers of public transportation in the MPO.

To increase the accountability and transparency of the Federal-aid highway and Federal transit programs and to improve project decision-making through performance-based planning and programming, MAP–21 establishes a performance management framework. The MAP–21 requires FHWA to establish, through a separate rulemaking, performance measures and standards to be used by States to assess the condition of the pavements and bridges, serious injuries and fatalities, performance of the Interstate System and National Highway System, traffic congestion, on-road mobile source emissions, and freight movement on the Interstate System.[2] The MAP–21 also requires FTA to establish, through separate rulemakings, state of good repair and safety performance measures, and requires each provider of public transportation to establish performance targets in relation to these performance measures.[3]

To ensure consistency, an MPO must coordinate to the maximum extent practicable with the State and providers of public transportation to establish performance targets for the metropolitan planning area that address these performance measures.[4] An MPO must describe in its metropolitan transportation plans the performance measures and targets used to assess the performance of its transportation system.[5] Statewide and metropolitan transportation improvement programs (STIPs and TIPs) must include, to the maximum extent practicable, a description of the anticipated effect of the program toward achieving the performance targets established in the statewide or metropolitan transportation plan, linking investment priorities and the highway and transit performance targets.[6] These changes to the planning process will be addressed in FHWA and FTA's anticipated joint rulemaking amending 23 CFR part 450.

As part of its performance management framework, MAP–21 assigns MPOs the new transit related responsibilities described above, i.e., to establish performance targets with respect to transit state of good repair and transit safety and to address these targets in their transportation plans and TIPs. Representation by providers of public transportation in each MPO that serves a TMA will better enable the MPO to define performance targets and to develop plans and TIPs that support an intermodal transportation system for the metropolitan area. Including representation by providers of public transportation in each MPO that serves an area designated as a TMA is an essential element of MAP–21's performance management framework and will support the successful implementation of a performance-based approach to transportation decisionmaking.

The FTA and FHWA seek comment on the following proposals in this guidance: the determination of specifically designated representatives, the eligibility of representatives of providers of public transportation to

[1] 23 U.S.C. 134(k)(1); 49 U.S.C. 5303(k)(1).

[2] 23 U.S.C. 150(c).

[3] 49 U.S.C. 5326(b), (c), 5329(b), (d).

[4] 23 U.S.C. 134(h)(2); 49 U.S.C. 5303(h)(2).

[5] 23 U.S.C. 134(i)(2)(B); 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(2)(B).

[6] 23 U.S.C. 134(j)(2)(D); 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(2)(D) (TIPs) and 23 U.S.C. 135(g)(4); 49 U.S.C. 5304(g)(4) (STIPs).

serve as specifically designated representatives, and the cooperative process to select a specifically designated representative in MPOs with multiple providers of public transportation. There is wide variation in transit agency representation among MPOs and in the governance structure of MPOs throughout the country. To accommodate the many existing models of transit agency representation on MPO boards, this proposed guidance proposes flexible approaches for MPOs and providers of public transportation to work together to meet this requirement.

II. Specifically Designated Representatives

MAP–21 requires that by October 1, 2014, MPOs that serve an area designated as a TMA must include local elected officials; officials of public agencies that administer or operate major modes of transportation in the metropolitan area, including representation by providers of public transportation; and appropriate State officials.[7] The requirement to include ''representation by providers of public transportation'' is a new requirement under MAP–21. The FHWA and FTA construe that the intent of this provision is that representatives of providers of public transportation, once designated, will have equal decision-making rights and authorities as other members listed in 23 U.S.C. 134(d)(2)(B) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(d)(2)(B) that are on the policy board of an MPO that serves a TMA. This expectation reflects the long-standing position of FHWA and FTA with respect to statutorily required MPO board members.[8]

A public transportation representative on an MPO board is referred to herein as the ''specifically designated representative.'' A specifically designated representative should be an elected official or a direct representative employed by the agency being represented, such as a member of a public transportation provider's board of directors, or a senior transit agency official like a chief executive officer or a general manager.

[7] 23 U.S.C. 134(d)(2); 49 U.S.C. 5303(d)(2).

[8] While this guidance specifically addresses the new requirement for representation by providers of public transportation, all MPOs that serve a TMA must consist of local elected officials; officials of public agencies that administer or operate major modes of transportation in the metropolitan area, including representation by providers of public transportation; and appropriate State officials by October 1, 2014. 23 U.S.C. 134(d)(2); 49 U.S.C. 5303(d)(2). Only those MPOs acting pursuant to authority created under State law that was in effect on December 18, 1991, that meet the requirements of 23 U.S.C. 134(d)(3) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(d)(3), are exempt.

III. Providers of Public Transportation

This guidance proposes that only representation by providers of public transportation that operate in a TMA and are direct recipients [9] of the Urbanized Area Formula Funding program [10] will satisfy 23 U.S.C. 134(d)(2)(B) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(d)(2)(B).

IV. Process for the Selection of Specifically Designated Representatives

The FTA and FHWA's Metropolitan Transportation Planning rule at 23 CFR 450.314 provides for metropolitan planning agreements in which MPOs, States, and providers of public transportation cooperatively determine their mutual responsibilities in carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process. This guidance proposes that MPOs that serve an area designated as a TMA should cooperate with providers of public transportation and the State to amend their metropolitan planning agreements to include the cooperative process for selecting the specifically designated representative(s) for inclusion on the MPO board and for identifying the representative's role and responsibilities.

V. Role of the Specifically Designated Representative

To the extent that an MPO has bylaws, the MPO should, in consultation with transit providers in the TMA, develop bylaws that describe the establishment, roles, and responsibilities of the specifically designated representative. These bylaws should explain the process by which the specifically designated representative will identify transit-related issues for consideration by the full MPO policy board and verify that transit priorities are considered in planning products to be adopted by the MPO. In TMAs with multiple providers of public transportation, the bylaws also should outline how the specifically designated representative(s) will consider the needs of all eligible [11] providers of public transportation and address issues that are relevant to the responsibilities of the MPO.

VI. Restructuring MPOs To Include Representation by Providers of Public Transportation

Title 23 U.S.C. 134(d)(5)(B) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(d)(5)(B) provide that an MPO may be restructured to meet MAP–21's representation requirements without having to secure the agreement of the Governor and units of general purpose government as part of a redesignation.

There are multiple providers of public transportation within most TMAs. In large MPOs that include numerous municipal jurisdictions and multiple providers of public transportation, FTA and FHWA expect that it would not be practical to allocate separate representation to each provider of public transportation. Consequently, this guidance proposes that an MPO that serves an area designated as a TMA that has multiple providers of public transportation should cooperate [12] with the eligible providers to determine how the MPO will include representation by providers of public transportation.

There are various approaches to meeting this requirement. For example, an MPO may allocate a single board position to eligible providers of public transportation collectively, providing that one specifically designated representative must be agreed upon through the cooperative process. The requirement for specifically designated representation might also be met by rotating the board position among all eligible providers or by providing all eligible providers with proportional representation. However the representation is ultimately designated, the MPO should provide specifics of the designation in its bylaws, to the extent it has bylaws.

Apart from the requirement for specifically designated representation on the MPO's board, an MPO also may allow for transit representation on policy or technical committees. Eligible providers of public transportation not given decision-making rights on the MPO's board may hold positions on policy or technical committees.

The FHWA and FTA encourage MPOs, State Departments of Transportation, local stakeholders, and transit providers to take this opportunity to determine the most effective governance and institutional arrangements to best serve the interests of the metropolitan planning area.

Peter Rogoff,

FTA Administrator.

Victor M. Mendez,

FHWA Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2013–23780 Filed 9–27–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

[9] A direct recipient is defined as a public entity that is legally eligible under Federal transit law to apply for and receive grants directly from FTA.

[10] 49 U.S.C. 5307.

[11] Eligible transit agencies are those that are direct recipients of the Urbanized Area Formula Funding program, 49 U.S.C. 5307, and operate in a TMA.

[12] Cooperation means that the parties involved in carrying out the transportation planning and programming processes work together to achieve a common goal or objective. 23 CFR 450.104.