environmental document in accordance with the policy memorandum titled, “Environmental Document Quality Control Program under the NEPA Pilot Program” (July 2, 2007). As was identified in past audits, incomplete and incorrectly completed QC certification forms continued to be identified in this audit. During project file reviews by the audit team, the following instances of incomplete or incorrect QC certification forms were observed:

(a) Four Internal QC certification forms (for three projects) were completed and signed and dated by reviewers after the approval date of the document;

(b) One class of action determination form was signed on the same date that the document was approved;

(c) Five 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. This included four projects where external QC certification forms contained signatures that were obtained after the internal QC certification form signatures; and

(d) Five QC certification forms were missing the signatures of required reviewers.

(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). The policy memorandum included the revision to the quality control program that includes the addition of a NEPA QC Review. The purpose of this review component is to ensure that the environmental document complies with the FHWA policies and guidance and the requirements of all applicable Federal laws, executive orders, and regulations. Interviews with Caltrans staff and project file reviews in one District indicated that a NEPA QC reviewer was directed by the Office Chief of Environmental Affairs and the District Director to sign the internal certification form without having reviewed the final version of the environmental document in order to meet the project schedule. The NEPA QC reviewer had noted in the project file that there were two items, previously identified to be addressed, that had not yet been addressed in the document that was signed.

(D4) Re-evaluation Process—MOU Section 5.1 requires Caltrans to be subject to the same procedural and substantive requirements that apply to DOT in carrying out the responsibilities assumed under the Pilot Program. This includes the process and documentation for conducting NEPA re-evaluations to comply with 23 CFR 771.129. Additionally, SER Chapter 33 discusses revalidations and re-evaluations. As in past audits, project file reviews and staff interviews identified varying degrees of understanding of, and compliance with, these procedures and the improper use of re-evaluation documentation to serve another project development purpose. Project file reviews identified the following inconsistencies with regards to re-evaluations:

(a) A re-evaluation is done to determine if the approved environmental document or the Categorical Exclusion (CE) designation remains valid. In the re-evaluation process, the original decision and analysis needs to be reviewed for its validity. A re-evaluation was used to increase the scope of the original EA/ FONSI. The FHWA re-evaluation process does not accommodate such an approach. The supporting documentation and project files for this project were not available for review; and

(b) In a second project, the NEPA document was identified in the Quarterly Report as a re-evaluation. This project was identified as an intersection improvement that was to be added to a larger project, already under construction. The project file contained both re-evaluation forms and CE checklist forms. Under NEPA, the project should have been a stand-alone CE, as it was not a part of the original project.

(D5) 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. As was also noted in the fourth and fifth FHWA audits of the Pilot Program, project file reviews and interviews with staff conducted during this audit identified inconsistencies with the implementation and documentation requirements for conducting the Section 4(f) provisions. In the case of Section 4(f) evaluations, the audit team found the following:

(a) Two of the three evaluations did not contain a required Section 4(f) avoidance alternative analysis.

(b) Two of the three evaluations did not provide a required Least Overall Harm Analysis.

(D6) Statement Regarding Assumption of Responsibility—MOU section 3.2.5 requires language regarding Caltrans’ assumption of responsibility under 23 U.S.C. 327 be included on the cover page of each environmental document for all assumed Pilot Program projects. The audit teams’ project file reviews found the following inconsistencies with this requirement:

(a) The cover page for one EA reviewed during the audit did not include this required statement;

(b) The cover page for one Final EIS had been modified from the language agreed to in the MOU; and

(c) The cover page for three California Environmental Quality Act only documents contained the FHWA assumption statement, even though there was no FHWA involvement in this document.

[PR Doc. 2012–3977 Filed 2–21–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration


Quality 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 36 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 March 2, 2012. Comments must be received on or before March 23, 2012.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments bearing the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) numbers: FMCSA–
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 36 individuals who have requested renewal of their exemptions in accordance with FMCSA procedures. FMCSA has evaluated these 36 applications for renewal on their merits and decided to extend each exemption for a renewable two-year period. They are:

- William M. Arbogast (FL), Cris D. Bush (TN), John E. Cain (NM), Billy C. Chenault (NM), Eugene Contreras (NM), Jim L. Davis (NM), David E. Evans (NC), Nigel L. Farmer (CT), Wayne W. Ferguson (VA), Randy M. Garcia (NM), John A. Graham (PA), Henry J. Gregoire, Jr. (MN), Jason L. Hoovan (UT), Amos W. Hulsey (AL), Guy A. Lanham (FL), Curtis M. Lawless (VA), James M. McCormick (ID), Joseph F. McIntyre, Jr. (GA), Richard K. Mell (VA), Glen A. Miller (VA), Shane W. Mincey (AL), Russell L. Movers (WV), Millard F. Neace, II (WV), William E. Norris (NC), Frank L. Orlanfino (OH), Willie L. Parks (CA), Paul D. Prillaman (VA), Scott Randol (MO), Clarence J. Robishaw, Jr (NY), Miguel A. Sanchez (NM), Dennis R. Schneider (NM), James Vickers (KY), Norman J. Watson (NC), Lewis H. West, Jr. (MA), Billy R. Wilkey (TX), Reginald J. Wuetrich (IL).

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 36 applicants has satisfied the entry conditions for obtaining an exemption from the vision requirements (72 FR 46261; 72 FR 54972; 72 FR 58362; 72 FR 67340; 72 FR 67344; 73 FR 1395; 73 FR 35194; 73 FR 48275; 74 FR 37295; 74 FR 48343; 74 FR 57553; 74 FR 60022; 74 FR 65842; 74 FR 65845; 75 FR 1835; 75 FR 4623; 75 FR 9482). Each of these 36 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
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DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration


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 10 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 March 15, 2012. Comments must be received on or before March 23, 2012.


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


• 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 10 individuals who have requested renewal of their exemptions in accordance with FMCSA procedures. FMCSA has evaluated these 10 applications for renewal on their merits and decided to extend each exemption for a renewable two-year period. They are: Gene Bartlett, Jr. (VT), Ronald D. Boeve (MI), Marland L. Brassfield (TX), Dale M. Cannon (OR), Jamie French (NC), Wayne H. Holt (UT), Billy R. Jefferies (WV), Carlos A. Mendez-Castellon (VA), Gary N. Wilson (UT), William B. Wilson (KY).

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