this information, and the collection method. For the SDOT that did not construct noise barriers within the time period, there is no burden.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: It is estimated that the total annual burden is 139 hours annually.

Electronic Access: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the online instructions for accessing the dockets.

Authority: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995; 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended; and 49 CFR 1.48.

Issued on: January 22, 2008.

Iames R. Kabel.

Chief, Management Programs and Analysis Division.

[FR Doc. E8–1494 Filed 1–28–08; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Notice of Final Federal Agency Actions on a Proposed Highway Project in California

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), U.S. DOT. **ACTION:** Notice of Limitation on Claims for Judicial Review of Actions by FHWA and other Federal agencies.

SUMMARY: This notice announces actions taken by the FHWA and other Federal agencies that are final within the meaning of 23 U.S.C. 139(1)(1). These actions relate to a proposed Highway project on Interstate 5 at the Cosumnes River Boulevard Interchange from South of the Pocket/Meadowview Road Interchange and North of Laguna Blvd. interchange between Post Mile 14.3 to 15.5 in Sacramento. County, State of California. These actions grant approval for the project.

DATES: By this notice, the FHWA is advising the public of final agency actions subject to 23 U.S.C. 139(1)(1). A claim seeking judicial review of the Federal agency actions on the highway project will be barred unless the claim is filed on or before July 28, 2008. If the Federal law that authorizes judicial review of a claim provides a time period of less than 180 days for filing such claim, then that shorter time period still applies.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Cesar Perez, Senior Transportation Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, 650 Capitol Mall, #4– 100, Sacramento, CA 95814, weekdays between 7 a.m. and 4 p.m., telephone 916–498–5065, cesar.perez@fhwa.dot.gov, or John Webb, Supervisory Environmental Planner, California Department of Transportation, 2389 Gateway Oaks Dr., Sacramento, CA 95833, weekdays between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., (916) 274–0588, John Webb@dot.ca.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is hereby given that the FHWA and other Federal agencies have taken final agency actions by issuing approvals for the following highway project in the State of California. This project proposes to construct a new Cosumnes River Boulevard interchange on Interstate 5 in South Sacramento. In addition to the interchange, the project would extend to Cosumnes River Blvd. from its current terminus at Franklin Blvd west to the new interchange location and further west to Freeport Blvd. The project is intended to provide an East-West connector between I-5 and State Route 99 to improve mobility within the southerly limits of the city of Sacramento.

Actions by the Federal agencies and the laws under which such actions were taken are described in the Final Environmental Assessment for the project. The Record of Decision (ROD) was approved on January 15, 2008. The Final Environmental Impact Statement and other documents in the FHWA administrative record file are available by contacting the FHWA or the California Department of Transportation at the addresses provided above.

This notice applies to all Federal agency decisions as of the issuance date of this notice and all laws under which such actions were taken, including but not limited to:

- 1. *General:* National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) [42 U.S.C. 4321–4351]; Federal-Aid Highway Act [23 U.S.C. 109].
- 2. *Air:* Clean Air Act 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671(q).
- 3. Wildlife: Endangered Species Act [16 U.S.C. 1531–1544 and Section 1536], Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act [16 U.S.C. 661–667(d)]. Migratory Bird Treaty Act [16 U.S.C. 703–712].
- 4. Historic and Cultural Resources: Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended [16 U.S.C. 470(aa) 11]; Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1977 [16 U.S.C. 470(aa)–11]; Archeological and Historic Preservation Act [16 U.S.C. 469–469(c)]; Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) [25 U.S.C. 3001–3013].
- 5. Social and Economic: Civil Rights Act of 1964 [42 U.S.C. 2000(d)–2000(d) (1)]; American Indian Religious Freedom Act [42 U.S.C. 1996]; Farmland

Protection Policy Act (FPPA) [7 U.S.C. 4201–4209]; The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.

6. Hazardous Materials:
Comprehensive Environmental
Response, Compensation, and Liability
Act (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. 9601–9675;
Superfund Amendments and
Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA);
Resource Conservation and Recovery
Act (RCRA) 42 U.S.C. 6901–6992(k).

7. Executive Orders: E.O. 11990
Protection of Wetlands; E.O. 11988
Floodplain Management; E.O. 12898,
Federal Actions to Address
Environmental Justice in Minority
Populations and Low Income
Populations; E.O. 11593 Protection and enhancement of Cultural Resources;
E.O. 13007 Indian Sacred Sites; E.O. 13287 Preserve America; E.O. 13175
Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments; E.O. 11514
Protection and Enhancement of
Environmental Quality; E.O. 13112
Invasive Species.

(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.)

Authority: 23 U.S.C. I39 (1)(1)

Issued on: January 17, 2008.

Nancy E. Bobb,

Director, State Programs, Sacramento, California.

[FR Doc. 08–289 Filed 1–28–08; 8:45am] BILLING CODE 4910–RY–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA-01-10578, FMCSA-05-21711, FMCSA-05-22194, FMCSA-05-22727]

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 12 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 January 27, 2008. Comments must be received on or before February 28, 2008.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments bearing the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Docket ID FMCSA-01-10578, FMCSA-05-22191, FMCSA-05-22194, FMCSA-05-22727, using any of the following methods.

- Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
- *Mail:* Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., West Building, Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590–0001.
- 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.

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 FDMS is available 24 hours each day, 365 days each year. If you want acknowledgment that we received your comments, please include a selfaddressed, 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 the DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477–78; Apr. 11, 2000). This

information is also available at http:// DocketInfo.dot.gov.

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:

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 12 individuals who have requested a renewal of their exemption in accordance with FMCSA procedures. FMCSA has evaluated these 12 applications for renewal on their merits and decided to extend each exemption for a renewable two-year period. They are:

Francis M. Anzulewicz; Donald R. Date, Jr.; Kenneth R. Murphy; Donald J. Bierwirth, Jr.; John E. Kimmet, Jr.; Paul D. Schnautz; Arthur L. Bousema; Jason L. Light; Robert A. Sherry; Matthew Daggs; Robert Mollicone; John R. Snyder.

These exemptions are extended subject to the following conditions: (1) That each individual have a physical examination every year (a) by an ophthalmologist or optometrist who attests that the vision in the better eye continues to meet the standard 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 provide 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 retain 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 12 applicants has satisfied the entry conditions for obtaining an exemption from the vision requirements (66 FR 53826; 66 FR 66966; 68 FR 69434; 70 FR 74102; 70 FR 48797; 70 FR 61493; 70 FR 57353; 70 FR 72689; 70 FR 71884; 70 FR 4632). Each of these 12 applicants has requested renewal of the exemption and has submitted evidence showing that the vision in the better eye continues to meet the standard 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 standards. 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 drivers submit comments by February 28, 2008.

FMCSA believes that the requirements for a renewal of an exemption under 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315 can be satisfied by initially granting the renewal and then requesting and evaluating, if needed, subsequent comments submitted by interested parties. As indicated above, the Agency previously published

notices of final disposition announcing its decision to exempt these 12 individuals from the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). The final decision to grant an exemption to each of these individuals was based on the merits of each case and only after careful consideration of the comments received to its notices of applications. The notices of applications stated in detail the qualifications, experience, and medical condition of each applicant for an exemption from the vision requirements. That information is available by consulting the above cited Federal Register publications.

Interested parties or organizations possessing information that would otherwise show that any, or all of these drivers, are not currently achieving the statutory level of safety should immediately notify FMCSA.

The Agency will evaluate any adverse evidence submitted and, if safety is being compromised or if continuation of the exemption would not be consistent with the goals and objectives of 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, FMCSA will take immediate steps to revoke the exemption of a driver.

Issued on: January 22, 2008

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator for Policy and Program Development.

[FR Doc. E8–1527 Filed 1–28–08; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2008-0009; Notice 1]

Bridgestone Firestone North American Tire, LLC, Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Bridgestone Firestone North American Tire, LLC (BFNT) has determined that certain tires that it manufactured in September and October of 2007, did not fully comply with paragraph S5.5.1(a) of 49 CFR 571.139, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 139 New Pneumatic Radial Tires for Light Vehicles. For the passenger car and light truck tires it regulates, FMVSS No. 139 requires mandatory compliance for new tires manufactured on or after September 1, 2007. BFNT has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports.

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) (see implementing rule at 49

CFR part 556), BFNT 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.

This notice of receipt of BFNT's petition is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the petition.

Affected are approximately 3,963 Bridgestone brand P235160R17, DUELER H/T 684 II tires, produced in the Aiken Plant during the DOT weeks of 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42 in 2007. Paragraph S5.5.1(a) of 49 CFR 571.139 requires that for regulated radial passenger car and light truck tires manufactured on or after September 1, 2007, but before September 1, 2009, they be permanently labeled with the tire identification number required by 49 CFR part 574 on a sidewall of the tire. Except for retreaded tires, either the tire identification number or a partial tire identification number containing all characters in the tire identification number, except for the dated code and, at the discretion of the manufacturer, any optional code, must be labeled on the other sidewall of the tire.

BFNT explains that 3,963 P235160R17 size Bridgestone Dueler AIT 684 11 tires, produced at its Aiken plant (DOT serial code is 7XOUBD43807 through 7XOUBD44207) were mismarked as explained below. 1,862 of these tires are currently under BFNT's control and 2,101 remain in the replacement market in the U.S.

BFNT describes the mismarking by stating that the affected tires are marked with a complete Tire Identification Number (TIN) on one sidewall and no TIN or partial TIN on the opposite sidewall. Therefore, the noncompliance is a sidewall mismarking as follows:

Actual stamping is BLANK. (on one sidewall).

Correct stamping should be: 7XOUBD4 (on that sidewall).

BFNT states that it believes that the noncompliance described herein is inconsequential as it relates to Motor Vehicle Safety. The subject tires were not marked with the partial TIN on one sidewall as required. BFNT believes that this noncompliance is unlikely to have an adverse impact on motor vehicle safety since the actual performance of the subject tires will not be affected by the mismarking.

BFNT makes the argument that the noncompliant tires meet or exceed all performance requirements of FMVSS No. 139, and will have no impact on the operational performance or safety of

vehicles on which these tires are mounted.

BFNT further states that the Tire Identification Number (TIN) becomes important in the event of a safety campaign so that the consumer may properly identify the recalled tire(s). The subject tires are marked in the same manner that was the requirement for many years until the FMVSS 139 markings which required additional TIN information on the opposite sidewall became effective. For this mislabeling any safety campaign communication, if necessary, could include in the listing of recalled TINs, direction to the consumer to read both sidewalls of each tire on the vehicle for the TINs or partial TINs so that the consumer would know that these mislabeled tires are included in any future recall.

In view of the information and facts presented, BFNT submits that the mismarking of the subject tires should be deemed inconsequential as it relates to Motor Vehicle Safety and requests that it be granted an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of the Safety Act.

NHTSA notes that due to the statutory provisions (49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h)) that permit manufacturers to file petitions for a determination of inconsequentiality allow NHTSA to exempt manufacturers only from the duties found in sections 30118 and 30120, respectively, to notify owners, purchasers, and dealers of a defect or noncompliance and to remedy the defect or noncompliance. Therefore, these provisions apply to only the 2,101 tires that have already passed from the manufacturer to an owner, purchaser, or dealer. Subsequent to receipt of the subject petition, BFNT informed NHTSA that they have remedied the mismarking on the 1,862 tires still under their control bringing those tires into compliance with FMVSS No. 139.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on this petition. Comments must refer to the docket and notice number cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted by any of the following methods:

a. By mail addressed to: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590.

b. By hand delivery to U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590. The Docket Section is open