

affect small businesses during and upon termination of the franchise agreement?

(4) Should 13 CFR 121.103(i) be modified to specifically address the provisions SBA has determined evidence excessive control by the franchisor?

(5) Should 13 CFR 121.103(i) be modified to incorporate a reference to "Loan Program Requirements, as defined in 13 CFR 120.10," because SBA's policies in this area are explained in the Loan Program Requirements, and more particularly in SBA's SOP 50 10?

(6) Should SBA develop a process to accept a certification of non-affiliation from a franchisor and/or its counsel, based on standards established by SBA, in lieu of SBA or lender review of the franchise agreement and related documents?

(7) If so, should that process be available only with respect to "renewal requests"—*i.e.*, only for franchisors that have had franchise agreements reviewed and approved by SBA in a prior year?

(8) If an applicant is not a franchisee but has an affiliate that is a franchisee, should SBA continue to review the affiliate's franchise agreement and related documents as part of the small business size determination of the applicant?

(9) Should SBA continue to list agreements on a central registry and, if so, where should that registry be maintained and by whom?

(10) If there is a cost associated with the maintenance of the registry, who should bear that cost? Should there be a charge for listing of agreements on a registry and, if so, who should bear the cost for such listing? SBA notes that there are statutory limitations on SBA's current authority to charge, retain and use fees.

(11) In light of the fact that SBA lists approved franchises on its Web site, is there a need to continue to post the Franchise Findings List as well?

(12) Should the franchise agreement review process be streamlined and/or simplified and, if so, in what way?

(13) Should the franchise appeal process be changed and, if so, in what way?

Dated: December 2, 2014.

Linda S. Rusche,

Director, Office of Financial Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2014-28698 Filed 12-5-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement; Washington, DC

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Revised Notice of Intent (NOI).

SUMMARY: FHWA is issuing this revised NOI as a correction to advise agencies and the public that a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) will be prepared for the South Capitol Street Project (the Project). The Project proposes to make major changes to the South Capitol Street Corridor from Firth Sterling Avenue SE. to Independence Avenue and the Suitland Parkway from Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE. to South Capitol Street, including replacing the existing Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge over the Anacostia River. This notice revises the NOI that was published in the **Federal Register** on July 28, 2014

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Federal Highway Administration, District of Columbia Division: Mr. Michael Hicks, Environmental/Urban Engineer, 1990 K Street NW., Suite 510, Washington, DC 20006-1103, (202) 219-3513, email: michael.hicks@dot.gov; or the District of Columbia Department of Transportation: Mr. E.J. Simie, PE, Project Manager, 55 M Street SE., Suite 400, Washington, DC 20003, (202) 671-2800, email: ej.simie@dc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In March 2011, the FHWA in conjunction with the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) approved release of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Project. The availability of the FEIS was announced in the April 8, 2011 **Federal Register**. The alternatives examined in detail in the FEIS included a No Build Alternative and three build alternatives: Build Alternatives 1 and 2 and the Preferred Alternative, which was a modification of Build Alternative 2. A movable arched bascule was selected for the new Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge. The alignment of the new bridge would be at an angle from the existing bridge to allow the swing span on the existing bridge to remain operational during construction, which meant that right-of-way would be needed from Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling (JBAB). Build Alternatives 1 and 2 were eliminated from consideration in the FEIS and, therefore, will not be considered in the SDEIS.

Since publication of the FEIS, FHWA and DDOT have considered major

changes regarding the design of the FEIS Preferred Alternative. Most notably, DDOT reconsidered the need to obtain right-of-way from JBAB, which resulted in changing the alignment of the proposed new Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge to a location immediately south of and parallel to the existing bridge. In addition, new information about current and planned navigation along the Anacostia River, including the navigation requirements of the U.S. Navy (USN), led to the decision to make the new bridge a fixed span structure instead of a movable span structure. Other notable design revisions made to the FEIS Preferred Alternative include the conversion of the east side traffic circle to a traffic oval similar in size to the proposed west traffic oval, and changes to the proposed ramps or ramp modifications between South Capitol Street and I-695, Suitland Parkway and I-295, and Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE. and Suitland Parkway. Due to these and other design changes, a Revised Preferred Alternative was developed.

The SDEIS will be prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371, *et seq.*), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), FHWA Code of Federal Regulations (23 CFR 771.101-771.137, *et seq.*), and all applicable Federal, State, and local government laws, regulations, and policies. The SDEIS will describe the revised preferred alternative, update the affected environment, and describe the anticipated environmental impacts of the Revised Preferred Alternative in comparison to the anticipated environmental impacts disclosed in the FEIS for the FEIS Preferred Alternative. The Purpose and Need of the Project did not change from the FEIS. The U.S. Navy; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; U.S. Coast Guard; the National Park Service; and the District of Columbia Department of the Environment will continue to serve as Cooperating Agencies for the Project.

A 45-day review period will be provided following the Notice of Availability of the SDEIS in the **Federal Register**, and a public meeting will be held within this review period. The public meeting will be conducted by DDOT and announced a minimum of 15 days in advance of the meeting. DDOT will provide information for the public meeting, including date, time and location through a variety of means including the Project Web site (<http://www.southcapitoileis.com>) and by newspaper advertisement.

To ensure that the full range of issues is identified early in the process, comments are invited from all interested and/or potentially affected parties. Comments or questions concerning this Notice should be directed to the FHWA and DDOT at the addresses provided above.

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

Authority: 23 U.S.C. 315; 49 CFR 1.48.

Issued on: November 17, 2014.

Joseph C. Lawson,

Division Administrator, District of Columbia Division, Federal Highway Administration.

[FR Doc. 2014-28720 Filed 12-5-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA-2014-0296]

Qualification of Drivers; Exemption Applications; Vision

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

ACTION: Notice of final disposition.

SUMMARY: FMCSA announces its decision to exempt 33 individuals from the vision requirement in the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs). They are unable to meet the vision requirement in one eye for various reasons. The exemptions will enable these individuals to operate commercial motor vehicles (CMVs) in interstate commerce without meeting the prescribed vision requirement in one eye. The Agency has concluded that granting these exemptions will provide a level of safety that is equivalent to or greater than the level of safety maintained without the exemptions for these CMV drivers.

DATES: The exemptions were granted October 31, 2014. The exemptions expire on October 31, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elaine M. Papp, R.N., 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. If you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the

docket, contact Docket Services, telephone (202) 366-9826.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Electronic Access

You may see all the comments online through the Federal Document Management System (FDMS) at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments, go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and/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.

Privacy Act: In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553(c), DOT solicits comments from the public to better inform its rulemaking process. DOT posts these comments, without edit, including any personal information the commenter provides, to www.regulations.gov, as described in the system of records notice (DOT/ALL-14 FDMS), which can be reviewed at www.dot.gov/privacy.

II. Background

On September 30, 2014, FMCSA published a notice of receipt of exemption applications from certain individuals, and requested comments from the public (79 FR 58856). That notice listed 33 applicants' case histories. The 33 individuals applied for exemptions from the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10), for drivers who operate CMVs in interstate commerce.

Under 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, FMCSA may grant an exemption for a 2-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 statute also allows the Agency to renew exemptions at the end of the 2-year period. Accordingly, FMCSA has evaluated the 33 applications on their merits and made a determination to grant exemptions to each of them.

III. Vision and Driving Experience of the Applicants

The vision requirement in the FMCSRs provides:

A person is physically qualified to drive a commercial motor vehicle if that person has distant visual acuity of at least 20/40 (Snellen) in each eye without corrective lenses or visual acuity separately corrected to 20/40 (Snellen) or better with corrective lenses, distant binocular acuity of a least 20/40 (Snellen) in both eyes with or without corrective lenses, field of vision of at least 70° in the horizontal meridian

in each eye, and the ability to recognize the colors of traffic signals and devices showing red, green, and amber (49 CFR 391.41(b)(10)).

FMCSA recognizes that some drivers do not meet the vision requirement but have adapted their driving to accommodate their vision limitation and demonstrated their ability to drive safely. The 33 exemption applicants listed in this notice are in this category. They are unable to meet the vision requirement in one eye for various reasons, including amblyopia, macular scar, histoplasmosis, retinal detachment, glaucoma, complete loss of vision, refractive amblyopia, central serous retinopathy, enucleation, macular scar, central suppression consistent with amblyopia, strabismic amblyopia, end stage maculopathy from toxoplasmosis, central retinal artery occlusion, exotropia, prosthetic eye, and a cataract. In most cases, their eye conditions were not recently developed. Twenty-three of the applicants were either born with their vision impairments or have had them since childhood.

The 10 individuals that sustained their vision conditions as adults have had it for a range of two to 42 years.

Although each applicant has one eye which does not meet the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10), each has at least 20/40 corrected vision in the other eye, and in a doctor's opinion, has sufficient vision to perform all the tasks necessary to operate a CMV. Doctors' opinions are supported by the applicants' possession of valid commercial driver's licenses (CDLs) or non-CDLs to operate CMVs. Before issuing CDLs, States subject drivers to knowledge and skills tests designed to evaluate their qualifications to operate a CMV.

All of these applicants satisfied the testing requirements for their State of residence. By meeting State licensing requirements, the applicants demonstrated their ability to operate a CMV, with their limited vision, to the satisfaction of the State.

While possessing a valid CDL or non-CDL, these 33 drivers have been authorized to drive a CMV in intrastate commerce, even though their vision disqualified them from driving in interstate commerce. They have driven CMVs with their limited vision in careers ranging from 2.5 to 50 years. In the past three years, two of the drivers were involved in crashes and one was convicted of a moving violation in a CMV.

The qualifications, experience, and medical condition of each applicant were stated and discussed in detail in