

(D2) *Section 4(f) Documentation*—MOU Section 5.1.1 affirms that Caltrans is subject to the same procedural and substantive requirements that apply to DOT in carrying out the responsibilities assumed under the Pilot Program. The SER Chapter 20, *Section 4(f) and Related Requirements*, sets forth procedures for documenting impacts to Section 4(f) properties in Caltrans-assigned environmental documents, while the *Forms and Templates* section of the SER contains annotated outlines for such documents, including appropriate language for addressing *de minimis* impacts (49 U.S.C. 303(d); 23 U.S.C. 139(b); 23 CFR 774.17). As was also noted in the fourth FHWA audit of the Pilot Program, project file reviews and interviews with staff during this audit identified inconsistencies in the documentation requirements for carrying out the Section 4(f) provisions. These included:

(a) For a bridge replacement project located within a National Forest, no documentation was provided in the EA document or in the project file regarding the Section 4(f) status of the recreational facilities in the immediate project vicinity or any possible project impacts to those resources;

(b) A project file contained a letter from the official with jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) recreational resource stating the impacts to the resource would be *de minimis*. Neither the EA document nor the project file contained the supporting documentation for that determination, as required under 23 CFR 774.7(b).

(c) The Section 4(f) discussion in the environmental document of another project (for which no NEPA approval had been made at the time of the audit) was unclear as to which type of Section 4(f) documentation and approval was being contemplated. The applicable section of the EA included the discussion of four different types of Section 4(f) approvals:

1. The EA described the project as qualifying for a Nationwide Programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation, but did not reach a conclusion pursuant to the applicable Programmatic.

2. The document then included a discussion similar to what is used in an individual Section 4(f) Evaluation, including impacts to Section 4(f) properties, avoidance alternatives, and measures to minimize harm, ending by stating that no preferred alternative had been identified for the project.

3. The EA also contained a Section 4(f) constructive use discussion, which reached no conclusion.

4. Finally, the project file contained an e-mail stating that although the EA

was missing expected language regarding *de minimis* impacts and a concurrence letter from the officials with jurisdiction, the Caltrans Branch Chief would sign the QA/QC sheets “with the assurance that the above items will be completed.”

(D3) *QA/QC Certification Process*—MOU Section 8.2.5 and SER Chapter 38 require Caltrans staff to review each environmental document in accordance with the policy memorandum titled, “Environmental Document Quality Control Program under the NEPA Pilot Program” (July 2, 2007). Incomplete and incorrectly completed QC certification forms continue to be identified. During project file reviews by the audit team, the following instances of incomplete or incorrect QC certification forms since the July 2009 audit were observed:

(a) An Environmental Assessment and Section 4(f) Evaluation was approved contingent on changes that still needed to be made to the document;

(b) One QC certification form was approved by the Quality Control Reviewer, Preparer, and Branch Chief without the technical reviewer’s signature due to pending comments;

(c) Five other QC certification forms contained undated review signatures or the signatures were not obtained in the proper sequence in accordance with the Caltrans established QA/QC processes;

(d) Two QC certification forms were missing the signatures of required reviewers. In those cases, a memo was included in the files documenting this oversight. One memo noted that the NEPA document that was approved for the project had been incomplete. No additional explanation was provided; and

(e) Two external QC certification forms contained signatures that were obtained after the internal QC certification form signatures. The SER Chapter 38 process requires the QC external certification form to be completed before the internal certification review can be initiated.

(D4) *Maintenance of Project and General Administrative Files*—MOU Section 8.2.4 requires Caltrans to maintain project and general administrative files pertaining to its discharge of the responsibilities assumed under the Pilot Program. Caltrans has instituted specific procedures for maintaining project files and has provided training on these procedures. Previous audits identified inconsistencies with the application of these procedures (*i.e.*, missing required documents, missing UFS tabs) and inconsistencies throughout the Districts visited in this audit were also identified. This audit also identified

inconsistencies with file maintenance in at least 15 of the approximately 80 project files reviewed. Examples of these include:

(a) Various types of required project documentation were missing from project files. Examples of missing documents included:

- Signed final environmental documents;
- Noise abatement decision report;
- Historic Properties Survey Report;
- Environmental Commitment

Records;

- Internal and external QC certification forms (some signed but undated);
- Signed copies of the PEAR/PES forms;

- Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement; and
- Information on the types of Section 4(f) resources and the projects’ impacts upon them.

(b) Two instances in which the project files were not available for review; in one case, the file has been improperly disposed, while in the other case, it was uncertain whether the project file had been misplaced or had never been set up.

[FR Doc. 2010–30326 Filed 12–2–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA–2010–0380]

#### Agency Information Collection Activities; Revision of a Currently-Approved Information Collection Request: Training Certification for Drivers of Longer Combination Vehicles

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

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), FMCSA announces its plan to submit the Information Collection Request (ICR) described below to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for its review and approval. The FMCSA requests approval to revise and extend an information collection request (ICR) entitled, “*Training Certification for Drivers of Longer Combination Vehicles*.” This ICR is necessary because the training certificates drivers are required to present to prospective employers serve as proof the drivers have successfully completed the

training to operate Longer Combination Vehicles (LCVs) safely on the Nation's highways. Motor carriers are required to maintain a copy of the training certification in each LCV driver's qualification file, which may be reviewed by Federal or State enforcement officials. This ICR is being revised due to an anticipated increase in the estimated number of LCV drivers submitting training certificates to employers resulting in a change to the estimated information collection burden for this training task. On September 9, 2010, FMCSA published a **Federal Register** notice allowing for a 60-day comment period on the ICR. No comment was received.

**DATES:** Please send your comments by January 3, 2011. OMB must receive your comments by this date in order to act quickly on the ICR.

**ADDRESSES:** All comments should reference Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Docket Number FMCSA-2010-0380. Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on the proposed information collection to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget. Comments should be addressed to the attention of the Desk Officer, Department of Transportation/Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, and sent via electronic mail to [oir\\_submission@omb.eop.gov](mailto:oir_submission@omb.eop.gov), or faxed to (202) 395-6974, or mailed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Docket Library, Room 10102, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Thomas Yager, Chief, Driver and Carrier Operations Division, Department of Transportation, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, West Building 6th Floor, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: 202-366-4325; e-mail [tom.yager@dot.gov](mailto:tom.yager@dot.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title:* Training Certification for Drivers of Longer Combination Vehicles.  
*OMB Control Number:* 2126-0026.  
*Type of Request:* Revision of a currently-approved information collection.

*Respondents:* Drivers who complete LCV training each year, current LCV drivers who submit the LCV Driver-Training Certificate to a prospective employer, and motor carriers receiving and filing the certificates.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 31,500 drivers and motor carriers (700

new LCV drivers plus 15,050 current LCV drivers plus 15,750 motor carriers).

*Estimated Number of Responses:* 31,500 (700 new LCV drivers plus 15,050 current LCV drivers plus 15,750 motor carriers).

*Estimated Time per Response:* 10 minutes for preparation of LCV Driver-Training Certificate and an additional 10 minutes for the use of the LCV Driver-Training Certificate during the hiring process each year.

*Expiration Date:* February 28, 2011.

*Frequency of Response:* At various times during the year.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden:* 2,742 hours. The total number of drivers per year for whom this activity will occur consists of newly-trained LCV drivers (700) and current LCV drivers changing employers (15,050), a total of 15,750 drivers. The total annual information collection burden is estimated to be 2,742 hours: Preparation of LCV Driver-Training Certificate [700 newly trained LCV drivers × 10 minutes ÷ 60 minutes], and use of the certificate during the hiring process [15,750 total LCV drivers × 10 minutes ÷ 60 minutes].

*Background:* Section 4007(b) of the Motor Carrier Act of 1991 (Title IV of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA), Public Law 102-240, 105 Stat. 1914, 2152; 49 U.S.C. 31307) requires the Secretary of Transportation to establish Federal minimum training requirements for drivers of LCVs. The responsibility for implementing the statutory requirement was subsequently delegated to FMCSA (49 CFR 1.73). The FMCSA, in a final rule entitled, "Minimum Training Requirements for Longer Combination Vehicle (LCV) Operators and LCV Driver-Instructor Requirements" adopted implementing regulations for minimum training requirements for the operators of LCVs (March 30, 2004; 69 FR 16722).

The 2004 final rule created an information collection burden concerning the certification of new, current and non-grandfathered LCV drivers. An LCV is any combination of a truck-tractor and two or more semi-trailers or trailers, which operates on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways (as defined in 23 CFR 470.107) and has a gross vehicle weight greater than 80,000 pounds. The purpose of this rule is to enhance the safety of LCV operations on our nation's highways.

By regulation, motor carriers cannot allow a driver to operate an LCV without ensuring that the driver has been properly trained in accordance with the requirements of 49 CFR 380.113. LCV drivers must present their

LCV Driver-Training Certificate to prospective employers as proof of qualification to drive LCVs. Motor carriers must maintain a copy of the LCV Training Certificate in order to be able to show Federal, State or local officials that drivers operating LCVs are certified to do so.

*Definitions:* The LCV training regulations under 49 CFR part 380 are applicable only to drivers of "longer combination vehicles," defined as "any combination of a truck-tractor and two or more trailers or semi-trailers, which operate[s] on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways (defined in 23 CFR 470.107) with a gross vehicle weight greater than 80,000 pounds" (49 CFR 380.105).

*Public Comments Invited:* You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including: (1) Whether the proposed collection is necessary for the performance of FMCSA's functions; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways for FMCSA to enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the collected information; and (4) ways that the burden could be minimized without reducing the quality of the collected information. The Agency will summarize or include your comments in the request for OMB's clearance of this information collection.

Issued on: November 23, 2010.

**Kelly Leone,**

*Associate Administrator, Research and Information Technology.*

[FR Doc. 2010-30382 Filed 12-2-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-EX-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA-2010-0387]

#### Identification of Interstate Motor Vehicles: The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey's Drayage Truck Registry Sticker Display Requirements; Petition for Determination

**AGENCY:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation.

**ACTION:** Notice of petition for determination; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** FMCSA invites all interested persons to comment on a petition that the New Jersey Motor Truck Association (NJMTA) submitted requesting that FMCSA declare the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey's (Port Authority) Drayage Truck Registry