

public transportation supportive land use policies (one third).

FTA's approach to the project justification measures for Small Starts is identical to that described above for New Starts, meaning that they are based on existing procedures and information produced by project sponsors to the extent possible. The measure and rating for the cost effectiveness criterion does not change under this guidance. The measures and ratings for the economic development effects and public transportation supportive land use criteria are identical to those proposed for New Starts. The economic development effects rating will be based on two of the three subfactors previously used to rate land use (following the data reporting simplifications already in place for Small Starts projects)—transit supportive plans and policies and performance and impact of policies. The remaining land use subfactor previously used—existing land use—will be the basis for the public transportation supportive land use rating.

The simplest approach was used to determine the magnitude of the weights, with all of them weighted equally.

Projects that qualify for the Very Small Starts streamlined evaluation will continue to receive an automatic "medium" rating for project justification.

3. Alternatives With Tunnels

As a condition of advancement into preliminary engineering, FTA requires that alternatives analysis studies specifically analyze, evaluate, and consider the congestion relief, improved mobility, and other benefits of transit tunnels in those projects that include a transit tunnel and the associated ancillary and mitigation costs necessary to relieve congestion, improve mobility, and decrease air and noise pollution in those projects that do not include a tunnel, but where a transit tunnel was one of the alternatives analyzed. Additional analyses are required when different vertical alignments (*i.e.*, at-grade versus underground) of a proposed reasonable alternative result in disparate impacts to automobile congestion, mobility, air and noise pollution, and/or any other relevant consideration. FTA will ensure that such information has been addressed during the alternative analysis of projects that considered a tunnel as part of the FTA review of project applications for entry into preliminary engineering.

The mobility improvements, operating efficiencies, land use, economic development effects, and cost

effectiveness project justification criteria capture much of the benefits provided by tunnels. Additionally, FTA's consideration of "other factors," including the "case for the project" document, offers project sponsors the opportunity to present evidence not considered by the aforementioned criteria, including mitigation costs necessary due to the selection of an above-ground alignment. In evaluating the consequences of a tunnel option compared to a surface option, project sponsors are encouraged to use the full range of FTA project justification criteria to support local decision making during project planning.

Issued on: July 24, 2009.

Peter M. Rogoff,

Administrator, Federal Transit Administration.

[FR Doc. E9-18092 Filed 7-24-09; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No FMCSA-1998-4334; FMCSA-2000-7006; FMCSA-2000-7363; FMCSA-2000-8398; FMCSA-2001-9258; FMCSA-2003-14223; FMCSA-2003-14504; FMCSA-2004-19477; FMCSA-2005-20027; FMCSA-2005-20560; FMCSA-2006-26066; FMCSA-2007-27333; FMCSA-2007-27515.]

Qualification of Drivers; Exemption Renewals; Vision

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

ACTION: Notice of final disposition.

SUMMARY: FMCSA previously announced its decision to renew the exemptions from the vision requirement in the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations for 29 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 exemptions will provide a level of safety that will be equivalent to, or greater than, the level of safety maintained without the exemptions for these commercial motor vehicle (CMV) drivers.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Mary D. Gunnels, Director, Medical Programs, (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:

Electronic Access

You may see all the comments online through the Federal Document Management System (FDMS) at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

Background

Under 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, FMCSA may grant an exemption for a 2-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 statute also allows the Agency to renew exemptions at the end of the 2-year period. The comment period ended on July 2, 2009.

Discussion of Comments

FMCSA received no comments in this proceeding.

Conclusion

The Agency has not received any adverse evidence on any of these drivers that indicates that safety is being compromised. Based upon its evaluation of the 29 renewal applications, FMCSA renews the Federal vision exemptions for Gary A. Barrett, Ivan L. Beal, Johnny A. Beutler, Daniel R. Brewer, Darryl D. Cassatt, Larry Chinn, Brett L. Condon, Albion C. Doe, Sr., William K. Gullet, Daryl A. Jester, James P. Jones, Clyde H. Kitzan, Larry J. Lang, Spencer E. Leonard, Dennis D. Lesperance, John W. Locke, Herman G. Lovell, Ronald L. Maynard, Donald G. Meyer, William A. Moore, Jr., Earl R. Neugebauer, Danny R. Pickelsimer, Richard S. Rehbein, Bernard E. Roche, David E. Sanders, David B. Speller, Lynn D. Veach, Harry S. Warren, and Michael C. Wines.

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, each renewal 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.

Issued on: July 21, 2009.

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator for Policy and Program Development.

[FR Doc. E9-17975 Filed 7-28-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-EX-P