

was not warranted and would not be undertaken (Caltrans made the determination for the first Re-evaluation on June 17, 2010 and for the second Re-evaluation on December 28, 2011).

A claim seeking judicial review of the June 2010 and December 2011 Federal agency determinations to not undertake a SEIS will be barred if the claim is not filed within 180 days of the initial publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

Copies of the Re-evaluations are available for review by appointment only at the following locations. Please call to make arrangements for viewing:

Caltrans, District 3 Office, 703 B Street, Marysville, CA 95901, 530-741-4393, and Caltrans, District 3 Office, 2379 Gateway Oaks Drive, #150, Sacramento, CA, 916-274-0586.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Webb, Supervisory Environmental Planner, California Department of Transportation, 703 B Street, Marysville, CA 95901, 530-741-4393, [John\\_Webb@dot.ca.gov](mailto:John_Webb@dot.ca.gov).

Issued in Sacramento, California, July 12, 2012.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)

Issued on: July 17, 2012.

**Michael J. Duman,**

*Chief Operating Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Sacramento, California.*

[FR Doc. 2012-17875 Filed 7-20-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-22-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Transit Administration

#### Limitation on Claims Against Proposed Public Transportation Projects

**AGENCY:** Federal Transit Administration (FTA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces final environmental actions taken by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for projects in the following locations: Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT; Alameda County, CA; Cambridge, Medford, and Somerville, MA; Contra Costa County, CA; and Los Angeles County, CA. The purpose of this notice is to announce publicly the environmental decisions by FTA on the subject projects and to activate the limitation on any claims that may challenge these final environmental actions.

**DATES:** By this notice, FTA is advising the public of final agency actions subject to Section 139(l) of Title 23, United States Code (U.S.C.). A claim seeking judicial review of the FTA actions announced herein for the listed public transportation project will be barred unless the claim is filed on or before January 21, 2013.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Nancy-Ellen Zusman, Assistant Chief Counsel, Office of Chief Counsel, (312) 353-2577 or Terence Plaskon, Environmental Protection Specialist, Office of Human and Natural Environment, (202) 366-0442. FTA is located at 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590. Office hours are from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. EDT, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Notice is hereby given that FTA has taken final agency actions by issuing certain approvals for the public transportation projects listed below. The actions on these projects, as well as the laws under which such actions were taken, are described in the documentation issued in connection with the project to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and in other documents in the FTA administrative record for the projects. Interested parties may contact either the project sponsor or the relevant FTA Regional Office for more information on the project. Contact information for FTA's Regional Offices may be found at <http://www.fta.dot.gov>.

This notice applies to all FTA decisions on the listed projects as of the issuance date of this notice and all laws under which such actions were taken, including, but not limited to, NEPA [42 U.S.C. 4321-4375], Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 [49 U.S.C. 303], Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act [16 U.S.C. 470f], and the Clean Air Act [42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q]. This notice does not, however, alter or extend the limitation period of 180 days for challenges of project decisions subject to previous notices published in the **Federal Register**. The projects and actions that are the subject of this notice are:

1. *Project name and location:* Central Bus Operations and Maintenance Facility, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT. *Project sponsor:* Utah Transit Authority (UTA). *Project description:* The project will construct a new and larger bus facility to replace the existing one. The new facility will include bus storage for up to 250 vehicles, a new maintenance and

operations building, fuel/wash operations, a tank farm, compressed natural gas fueling facilities, detail bays, chassis wash bays, and a permanent location for support vehicles and equipment. *Final agency actions:* Section 4(f) determination; a Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement; project-level air quality conformity; and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), dated June 30, 2012. *Supporting documentation:* Environmental Assessment, dated May 2012.

2. *Project name and location:* East Bay Bus Rapid Transit Project, Alameda County, CA. *Project sponsor:* Alameda Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit). *Project description:* The project proposes to provide bus rapid transit (BRT) service along 9.52 miles from Downtown Oakland to the San Leandro BART Station. The project would operate with transit priority at all signalized intersections, new passenger stations, and a combination of mixed-flow and dedicated travel lanes throughout the alignment. The project would also feature pedestrian amenities, landscape treatments, barrier-free self-service proof of payment fare collection, real-time bus arrival information, and low-floor, dual-sided door buses. *Final agency actions:* No use of Section 4(f) resources; Section 106 finding of no adverse effect; project-level air quality conformity; and Record of Decision (ROD), dated June 8, 2012. *Supporting documentation:* Final Environmental Impact Statement/Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIS/EIR), dated January 2012.

3. *Project name and location:* Green Line Extension Project; Cambridge, Medford, and Somerville, MA. *Project sponsors:* Massachusetts Department of Transportation and Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. *Project description:* The project is to extend light rail transit service to College Avenue in Medford and Union Square in Somerville using a two branch operation, both within existing commuter rail rights-of-way. The 3.4 mile-long Medford Branch would operate from a relocated Lechmere Station to College Avenue. The 0.9 mile-long Union Square Branch would begin at the relocated Lechmere Station and terminate at Union Square in Somerville. The project includes a proposed maintenance and storage facility that will be required to support the Green Line Extension. *Final agency actions:* Section 4(f) determination; a Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement; project-level air quality conformity; and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), dated July

9, 2012. *Supporting documentation:* Environmental Assessment, dated October 2011.

4. *Project name and location:* Hercules Intermodal Transit Center, Contra Costa County, CA. *Project sponsor:* City of Hercules, CA. *Project description:* The project proposes to construct an intermodal transit center, which would include a new passenger train station on the existing Capitol Corridor line, a transit bus terminal, access roadways, trails, and parking facilities. The transit center would be located on the southeastern shoreline of San Pablo Bay and would be designed to accommodate potential future ferry service. *Final agency actions:* No use of Section 4(f) resources; a Section 106 finding of no adverse effect; project-level air quality conformity; and Record of Decision (ROD), dated June 14, 2012. *Supporting documentation:* Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (Final EIS/EIR), dated April 2012.

5. *Project name and location:* Regional Connector Transit Corridor Project, Los Angeles County, CA. *Project sponsor:* Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA). *Project description:* The project will provide a 1.9-mile direct connection of light rail transit (LRT) service from the shared Metro Blue Line and Metro Exposition Line terminus at the 7th Street/Metro Center Station to the Metro Gold Line tracks near 1st and Alameda Streets with three new below grade stations at 2nd/Hope Street, 2nd/Broadway, and 1st/Central Avenue. *Final agency actions:* Determination of *de minimis* impact to one Section 4(f) resource; a Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement; project-level air quality conformity; and Record of Decision (ROD), dated June 29, 2012. *Supporting documentation:* Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (Final EIS/EIR), dated January 2012.

Issued on: July 18, 2012.

**Lucy Garliauskas,**

*Associate Administrator for Planning and Environment, Washington, DC.*

[FR Doc. 2012-17838 Filed 7-20-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2009-0084; Notice 2]

#### American Honda Motor Co., Inc., Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of petition grant.

**SUMMARY:** American Honda Motor Co., Inc. (Honda), has determined that certain 2008 and 2009 model year Honda Civic Si model passenger cars when equipped with dealer accessory 18-inch diameter wheels do not fully comply with paragraph S4.2(a) of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 138, *Tire Pressure Monitoring Systems*. Honda filed an appropriate report dated December 3, 2008, pursuant to 49 CFR part 573 *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports*.

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) and the rule implementing those provisions at 49 CFR Part 556, Honda has petitioned for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Notice of receipt of the petition was published, with a 30-day public comment period, on May 12, 2009 in the **Federal Register** (74 FR 22202). No comments were received. To view the petition, and supporting documents log onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Web site at: <http://www.regulations.gov/>. Then follow the online search instructions to locate docket number "NHTSA-2009-0084."

For further information on this decision contact Mr. John Finneran, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), telephone (202)366-0645, facsimile (202) 366-5930.

*Vehicles involved:* The exact number of vehicles involved is not known. However, a total of approximately 952 wheels, or 238 complete wheel sets, were sold to Honda dealerships by Honda between July, 2006 and September, 2008. These wheel sets were sold with a replacement tire pressure placard in accordance with FMVSS No. 110, indicating a tire inflation pressure of 250 kPa (36 PSI) for 215/40RZ18 tires having a load capacity rating of 85Y.

*Noncompliance:* Honda explains that the noncompliance occurred because the recommended electronic method of

updating the TPMS inflation pressure settings to accommodate proper installation of the subject optional wheel sets incorrectly informed technicians that the adjustments had been completed successfully. The result is that the TPMS inflation pressure warning threshold remains at the standard setting for the original equipment 17-inch wheels of not less than 175 kPa (25 PSI) for the standard recommended tire pressure of 230 kPa (33 PSI). The minimum allowable TPMS threshold for the 18-inch accessory wheels should be 190 kPa (27 PSI), based on the recommended pressure of 250 kPa (36 PSI) as indicated on the replacement tire pressure placard. As a result, the low tire pressure warning telltale required by S4.2(a) will not illuminate at the 27 PSI minimum allowable TPMS threshold necessitated by installation of the dealer accessory wheels and tires.

#### Summary of Honda's Analysis and Arguments

Honda stated that it believes the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety because even at the lower TPMS threshold, adequate load capacity remains for the tires on the subject vehicles. Along with this statement Honda explained that the load capacity for each of the 215/40RZ18 85Y tires is 500 kilograms (1,100 lbs) at 230 kPa (33 PSI), calculated using the Japan Automotive Tyre Manufacturer's Association (JATMA) method, as recognized by NHTSA in FMVSS No. 110. The maximum allowable load according to the Gross Axle Weight Ratings (GAWR) for a 2008 or 2009 Civic Si is 477 kilograms (1,050 lbs) for each front tire and 425 kilograms (938 lbs) for each rear tire, well within the load capacity specified by JATMA.

Honda believes that the described noncompliance of its vehicles is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that its petition, to exempt from providing recall notification of noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30118 and remedying the recall noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30120 should be granted.

#### NHTSA's Decision

*NHTSA's Analysis:* For the agency's analysis of this petition the requirements of three associated Federal motor vehicle safety standards (FMVSS) were evaluated. First, as relates to FMVSS No. 110, we agree with Honda's statement that the 18-inch diameter tires have adequate load carrying capacity for the gross axle weight ratings assigned to any of the subject vehicles equipped with the dealer-installed tires. Two