

VII. Conclusion

Based upon its evaluation of the 46 exemption applications, FMCSA exempts the following drivers from the diabetes requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10), subject to the requirements cited above 949 CFR 391.64(b):

James M. Brooks (VA)
 Gary L. Brown (PA)
 Richard E. Campney (IA)
 Steven J. Causie (MI)
 Wesley A. Chain (TX)
 Richard M. Cohen (NJ)
 Alex A. Comella (NJ)
 Jeffrey R. Courtright (CO)
 Dwayne P. Daniels (PA)
 James T. Dodge (CO)
 Richard D. Domingo (NV)
 John J. Dominguez (TX)
 Mark S. Duda (PA)
 Vernon L. Fulton, Jr. (OR)
 Gary W. Giles (TX)
 Benny B. Gonzales (TX)
 Jerry W. Gott (IA)
 James L. Hummel (WA)
 Matthew J. Jensen (MN)
 Joseph A. Kipus (OH)
 Kevin L. Kreakie (OH)
 Gerald D. Layton (TX)
 Steve F. Levicoff (PA)
 Kevin C. Lewis (LA)
 Timothy M. Malo (ME)
 Paul J. Marshall (UT)
 David L. Mc Donald (IL)
 Thomas K. Miszler (PA)
 Rusty A. Neal (IL)
 Jacob B. Newman (GA)
 Duke R. Pendergraft (TX)
 Timothy K. Price (WV)
 Michael C. Prue (ME)
 Juan C. Rodriguez-Martinez (CA)
 Bradlee R. Saxby (IL)
 Barry L. Schwab (MI)
 Geoffrey E. Showaker (PA)
 Nicholas J. Shultz (IN)
 Kevin J. Sparks (ME)
 George E. Thompson (NJ)
 Dale W. Tucker (VA)
 William C. Vickery (NY)
 Cheryl L. Weber Gambill (IL)
 Robert A. Whitcomb (MA)
 Rodney L. Wichman (IL)
 Richard D. Wiegartz (IL)

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315 each exemption is 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: October 10, 2014.

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2014-25128 Filed 10-21-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-EX-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[Docket No. FD 35861]

California High Speed Rail Authority— Petition for Declaratory Order

On October 9, 2014, the California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) filed a petition requesting that the Board issue a declaratory order regarding the availability of injunctive remedies under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to prevent or delay construction of an approximately 114-mile high-speed passenger rail line between Fresno and Bakersfield, Cal. (the Line). The Board authorized construction of the Line, subject to certain conditions, in *California High-Speed Rail Authority—Construction Exemption—in Fresno, Kings, Tulare, & Kern Counties, California*, FD 35724 (Sub-No. 1) (STB served August 12, 2014) (Vice Chairman Miller concurring and Commissioner Begeman dissenting). The Authority states that seven lawsuits have been filed against the Authority challenging its compliance with CEQA with respect to the Line and that the lawsuits seek injunctive remedies under CEQA that would prevent or delay construction of the Line. The Authority argues that 49 U.S.C. 10501(b) would preempt such CEQA remedies because injunctive relief would enjoin construction of a Board-authorized project.

The Authority has requested that the Board issue an expedited declaratory order by November 20, 2014. The first case management conference for the lawsuits is scheduled for November 21, 2014, and the Authority claims that a declaratory order issued before that conference would remove uncertainty regarding the CEQA injunctive remedies available to the litigants. The Authority states that it served a copy of its petition on all counsel of record in the lawsuits.

The Board has discretionary authority under 5 U.S.C. 554(e) and 49 U.S.C. 721 to issue a declaratory order to eliminate a controversy or remove uncertainty. Here, it is appropriate to institute a declaratory order proceeding so that the Board can consider the issues raised in

the Authority's petition regarding whether 10501(b) would preempt CEQA injunctive remedies regarding the Line. The Board will therefore institute a proceeding to consider the matter. Interested persons may file substantive replies to the Authority's petition by November 6, 2014.

This action will not significantly affect either the quality of the human environment or the conservation of energy resources.

It is ordered:

1. A declaratory order proceeding is instituted.

2. Interested persons may file substantive replies to the Authority's petition by November 6, 2014.

3. This decision is effective on its service date.

By the Board.

Rachel D. Campbell,

Director, Office of Proceedings.

Brendetta S. Jones,

Clearance Clerk.

[FR Doc. 2014-25130 Filed 10-21-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

October 17, 2014.

The Department of the Treasury will submit the following information collection requests to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13, on or after the date of publication of this notice.

DATES: Comments should be received on or before November 21, 2014 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Send comments regarding the burden estimates, or any other aspect of the information collections, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to (1) Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for Treasury, New Executive Office Building, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, or email at OIRA_Submission@OMB.EOP.gov and (2) Treasury PRA Clearance Officer, 1750 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Suite 8141, Washington, DC 20220, or email at PRA@treasury.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Copies of the submissions may be obtained by emailing PRA@treasury.gov, calling (202) 622-1295, or viewing the entire information collection request at www.reginfo.gov.