

internal (QC) review (beyond the Core Team concept for project documentation) for NEPA process-related checks by TxDOT before the decisions were made would add value to the process, help ensure NEPA compliance, and assist with FHWA's requirement to make informed and fully compliant project authorization decisions.

11. *Narrow Definition of the QA/QC Performance Measure*

The team's Observation #11 was that the QA/QC measure for NEPA decisions focused only on EA and EIS projects. The team urges TxDOT to consider evaluating a broader range of NEPA related decisions (including, but not limited to CEs, re-evaluations, Section 4(f), and STIP/Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) consistency). Note that the recurring non-compliance observations occurred on CEs with either STIP/TIP or Section 4(f) items that were not ready for a decision to be made. In recent interviews with TxDOT staff, the team learned that TxDOT will examine other measures on an ongoing basis for internal use. The team believes that if the QA/QC refocuses attention not only on the documentation, but also on the required sequential NEPA process related items, that improved efficiencies related to TxDOT's NEPA decision and FHWA project authorization could result. The team believes that a more relevant focus on process could potentially help avoid non-compliance actions by TxDOT under the MOU and FHWA non-compliance observations in future audits.

12. *Performance Measure Utility*

Observation #12 was that the utility of several of the performance measures was difficult to determine. Also, the team was concerned that the measure for the TxDOT relationship with the public may be too limited by focusing on the number of complaints. Through recent interviews, the team learned that TxDOT staff agree with FHWA's concerns about utility. Quantifying changes in relationships with the public or agencies is possible, but the number is hard to interpret. Regarding the survey of agencies, TxDOT staff indicated that they did not know if agencies have higher expectations of TxDOT compared with other agencies. Considering the TxDOT relationship with the public, staff told the team that, during the preparation of their application, they considered various sorts of surveys and social media outreach. Given the cost of these approaches, TxDOT was not convinced of their utility and so decided not to use any of them. This leaves the

performance measure difficult to address for TxDOT and may be a recurring FHWA observation until it is resolved.

13. *TxDOT Reliance on the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Training Plan*

The team's Observation #13 was that the Caltrans training plan, which served as a basis for the TxDOT training plan, may not adequately meet the needs of TxDOT. The team urged TxDOT to consider other State DOT approaches to training. The TxDOT staff said in a recent interview that they had reviewed training plans from Virginia, Ohio, Alaska, and Florida. They also indicated that prior to Audit #2, TxDOT had completed a survey of staff in District offices and at ENV to assess training needs. The team was told that the surveys would be used to update the training plan in the spring of 2016.

14. *Adequacy of Training for non-TxDOT Staff*

Observation #14 urged TxDOT to assess whether the proposed training approach for non-TxDOT staff (relying heavily upon the annual ECC) is adequate and responsive enough to address a need to quickly disseminate newly developed procedures and policy. Through interviews, the team learned that TxDOT does not prioritize training classes specifically for non-TxDOT staff. The Director of ENV acknowledged that the training session at the recent ENV conference for LPA staff was not well attended and was thinking of reaching out to large planning organizations. The TxDOT concluded that its priority for training is first for TxDOT staff internally (ENV and District staff), second for consultants that TxDOT hires for environmental work, and third for LPAs. In years three and beyond of the TxDOT NEPA Assignment, the training plan may start to focus on the second, and eventually third, priority groups of individuals.

15. *What Training is Mandatory*

Observation #15 resulted in a team suggestion that the progressive training plan clearly identify the training required for each job classification. The TxDOT training coordinator told the team that the progressive training plan will address training required to meet State law (16 hours of training) and job task certification. This plan will be developed at the end of 2015.

16. *Training Plan, Consideration of Resource Agency Recommendations*

The team learned in a recent interview that in the fall of 2015 (as in the fall of 2014), TxDOT subject matter experts planned to reach out to resource agencies to ask what training they

would like to see conducted for TxDOT staff. Previously, USACE staff said that TxDOT needed Section 404 training. The TxDOT scheduled and completed Section 404 training in two different locations during October 2015. The TxDOT will continue to schedule Section 404 training.

Finalization of Report

The FHWA received one response from the TxDOT during the 30-day comment period for the draft report. The team has considered the TxDOT comments in finalizing this audit report. The TxDOT's comments reflect actions it has taken in response to the report's observations. The FHWA will address these follow up actions in the third audit report, now in preparation. Only one comment has resulted in a non-substantial change in this report. Observation #1 mentioned a possible communication issue with the THC. The FHWA agrees that the comment may not reflect the official position of the agency and has deleted the sentence mentioning the THC.

The TxDOT made several comments disputing non-compliance observation #1. Representatives from FHWA and TxDOT met to discuss non-compliance observation #1 on May 11, 2016. The TxDOT, via an email, has subsequently decided to withdraw their comments on this non-compliance observation. The final report discussion of non-compliance observation #1 has not been revised.

The FHWA has finalized the draft Audit #2 report previously published in the **Federal Register** without substantive changes.

[FR Doc. 2016-19476 Filed 8-15-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

[FTA Docket No. 2016-0028]

Notice of Request for the Extension of a Currently Approved Information Collection

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, and its implementing regulations, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) hereby announces that it is seeking renewal of the following currently approved information collection activities. Before submitting this information collection requirements for

clearance by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), FTA is soliciting public comment on specific aspects of the activities identified below.

Title: 49 U.S.C. Section 5307—Urbanized Area Formula Program.

OMB Number: 2132–0502.

Background: 49 U.S.C. 5307 The Urbanized Area Formula Funding program (49 U.S.C. 5307) makes Federal resources available to urbanized areas and to Governors for transit capital and operating assistance and for transportation related planning in urbanized areas. An urbanized area is a Census-designated area with a population of 50,000 or more as determined by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Funding is made available to designated recipients, which must be public bodies with the legal authority to receive and dispense Federal funds. Governors, responsible local officials and publicly owned operators of transit services are required to designate a recipient to apply for, receive, and dispense funds for urbanized areas pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 5307(a)(2). The Governor or Governor's designee is the designated recipient for urbanized areas between 50,000 and 200,000. Eligible activities include planning, engineering, design and evaluation of transit projects and other technical transportation-related studies; capital investments in bus and bus-related activities such as replacement of buses, overhaul of buses, rebuilding of buses, crime prevention and security equipment and construction of maintenance and passenger facilities; and capital investments in new and existing fixed guideway systems including rolling stock, overhaul and rebuilding of vehicles, track, signals, communications, and computer hardware and software. All preventive maintenance and some Americans with Disabilities Act complementary paratransit service costs are considered capital costs. For urbanized areas with populations less than 200,000, operating assistance is an eligible expense. For urbanized areas with 200,000 in population and over, funds are apportioned and flow directly to a designated recipient selected locally to apply for and receive Federal funds. For urbanized areas under 200,000 in population, the funds are apportioned to the Governor of each state for distribution. With the passing of Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act, the 100 Bus Rule was been expanded to include demand response service, excluding ADA complementary paratransit service. An exception to the 100 Bus Rule has been added as well.

If a public transportation system executes a written agreement with one or more other public transportation systems within the urbanized area to allocate funds by a method other than by measuring vehicle revenue hours, each public transportation system that is part of the written agreement may follow the terms of the written agreement instead of the measured vehicle revenue hours. Under Grant Recipient Requirements, a provision has been added that directs recipients to maintain equipment and facilities in accordance with their transit asset management plan. Recipients are no longer required to expend 1% of their funding for associated transit improvements. However, recipients are still required to submit an annual report listing projects that were carried out in the preceding fiscal year. The Passenger Ferry Grant Program is also available to urbanized areas under the authority provided through 49 U.S.C. 5307 (section 5307). This program provides discretionary opportunity to capital projects. Capital projects include, but are not limited to, the purchase, replacement, or rehabilitation of ferries and terminals and related equipment. Funds may not be used to fund operating expenses, planning, or preventive maintenance.

Respondents: State and local government, business or other for-profit institutions and non-profit institutions.

Estimated Annual Burden on Respondents: Approximately 50 hours for each of the 2,245 respondents.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 67,250 hours.

Frequency: Annual.

DATES: Comments must be submitted before October 17, 2016.

ADDRESSES: To ensure that your comments are not entered more than once into the docket, submit comments identified by the docket number by only one of the following methods:

1. *Web site:* www.regulations.gov.

Follow the instructions for submitting comments on the U.S. Government electronic docket site. (**Note:** The U.S. Department of Transportation's (DOT's) electronic docket is no longer accepting electronic comments.) All electronic submissions must be made to the U.S. Government electronic docket site at www.regulations.gov. Commenters should follow the directions below for mailed and hand-delivered comments.

2. *Fax:* 202–493–2251.

3. *Mail:* U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Docket Operations, M–30, West Building, Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590–0001.

4. *Hand Delivery:* U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Docket Operations, M–30, West Building, Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590–0001 between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays.

Instructions: You must include the agency name and docket number for this notice at the beginning of your comments. Submit two copies of your comments if you submit them by mail. For confirmation that FTA has received your comments, include a self-addressed stamped postcard. Note that all comments received, including any personal information, will be posted and will be available to Internet users, without charge, to www.regulations.gov. You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published April 11, 2000, (65 FR 19477), or you may visit www.regulations.gov. Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents and comments received, go to www.regulations.gov at any time. Background documents and comments received may also be viewed at the U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Docket Operations, M–30, West Building, Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590–0001 between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Section 5307—Tara Clark, Office of Program Management (202) 366–2623, or email: Tara.Clark@dot.gov. Passenger Ferry Program—Vanessa Williams, Office of Program Management (202) 366–4818 or email: Vanessa.Williams@dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Interested parties are invited to send comments regarding any aspect of this information collection, including: (1) The necessity and utility of the information collection for the proper performance of the functions of the FTA; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the collected information; and (4) ways to minimize the collection burden without reducing the quality of the collected information. Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection.

William Hyre,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Administration.

[FR Doc. 2016–19462 Filed 8–15–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–57–P