be released to the public by the submitter. Confidential business information must be clearly designated as such and the submission must be marked ''BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL'' at the top and bottom of the cover page and each succeeding page. Any comment containing business confidential information must be submitted by fax to Sandy McKinzy at (202) 395–3640. A non-confidential summary of the confidential information must be submitted to *www.regulations.gov*. The non-confidential summary will be placed in the docket and will be open to public inspection.

USTR may determine that information or advice contained in a comment submitted, other than business confidential information, is confidential in accordance with Section 135(g)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(g)(2)). If the submitter believes that information or advice may qualify as such, the submitter:

(1) Must clearly so designate the information or advice;

(2) Must clearly mark the material as ''SUBMITTED IN CONFIDENCE''

at the top and bottom of the cover page and each succeeding page; and

(3) Must provide a non-confidential summary of the information or advice.

Any comment containing confidential information must be submitted by fax. A non-confidential summary of the confidential information must be submitted to *www.regulations.gov*. The non-confidential summary will be placed in the docket and will be open to public inspection.

Pursuant to section 127(e) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3537(e)), USTR will maintain a docket on this dispute settlement proceeding, docket number USTR–2014–0001, accessible to the public at *www.regulations.gov*.

The public file will include non-confidential comments received by USTR from the public regarding the dispute. The following documents will be made available to the public at *www.ustr.gov:* The U.S. submissions, any non-confidential summaries or submissions received from other participants in the dispute, and any non-confidential summaries of submissions received from other participants in the dispute.

The report of the panel in this proceeding and, if applicable, the report of the Appellate Body, will be available on the Web site of the World Trade Organization, at *www.wto.org*. Comments open to public inspection may be viewed at *www.regulations.gov*.

Juan Millan,

Assistant United States Trade Representative for Monitoring and Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 2014–07876 Filed 4–7–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3290–F4–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Notice To Rescind a Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement: Orange and San Diego Counties, CA

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Notice to rescind a Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that it is rescinding two Notices of Intent (NOI) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a proposal to construct the extension of State Route 241 to Interstate 5 (I–5) in southern Orange County and northern San Diego County. The FHWA published the initial NOI in the **Federal Register** on February 20, 2001 and a supplemental NOI in the **Federal Register** on March 14, 2001. These rescissions are due in part to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce's December 2008 decision upholding the California Coastal Commission's (CCC) objection to the Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor Agency's (TCA) consistency determination for the proposed project. This NOI rescinds both NOIs.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tay Dam, Senior Transportation Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, California Division, Cal South Office, 888 S. Figueroa, Ste. 750, Los Angeles, California 90017, or Adnan Maiah, Project Manager, Caltrans-District 12, 3347 Michelson Drive, Suite 100, Irvine, CA. 92612.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in coordination with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and TCA, issued two NOIs on February 20, 2001 and March 14, 2001, to prepare an EIS for the proposed project. The project purpose was to alleviate future traffic congestion on I–5 and the arterial network in the southern Orange County area. The supplemental NOI provided notice of the preparation of a joint EIS pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act and an Environmental Impact Report pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

In February 2008, the CCC objected to TCA's consistency determination for its Preferred Alternative under the federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972. TCA appealed the objection to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce, which upheld the CCC's decision in December 2008. Subsequently, TCA began exploring possible modifications and/or alternatives to the Southern Orange County Transportation Infrastructure Improvement Plan (SOCTIIP).

After consultation with TCA and Caltrans, the FHWA is rescinding the initial and supplemental NOIs based, in part, on the U.S. Secretary of Commerce's December 2008 decision. Continued operational and environmental studies conducted after the December 2008 decision did not result in a resolution of CCC concerns regarding the locally preferred alternative. Any future transportation improvements would be treated as a new project and would need to be initiated and proceed under separate environmental review processes, in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations.

(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: April 2, 2014.

Larry Vinzant,

Senior Environmental Protection Specialist, Sacramento, California.

[FR Doc. 2014–07803 Filed 4–7–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA–2013–0069]

Hours of Service of Drivers: Timberdoodle Company's Application for Exemption

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

ACTION: Notice of final disposition; denial of application for exemption.

SUMMARY: FMCSA announces its denial of Timberdoodle Company's (Timberdoodle) request for an exemption from section 395.3(b)(1) of the ''Hours of Service [HOS] of Drivers'' regulations (49 CFR part 395). Section 395.3(b)(1) prohibits the operation of a

commercial motor vehicle (CMV) by anyone who has accumulated 60 hours of on-duty time in a period of 7 days. Timberdoodle requested that its drivers be allowed to exclude from this calculation all on-duty time other than time actually driving a CMV. FMCSA concluded that Timberdoodle has not demonstrated how its CMV operations under such an exemption would be likely to achieve a level of safety equivalent to or greater than the level of safety that would be obtained in the absence of the exemption.

DATES: FMCSA denied the application for exemption by letter dated December 9, 2013, after notice and opportunity for public comment.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Thomas Yager, Chief, FMCSA Driver and Carrier Operations Division; Office of Bus and Truck Standards and Operations; Telephone: 202–366–4325. Email: *MCPSD@dot.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Docket

You may read background documents or comments filed to the docket of this application for exemption by going to www.regulations.gov at any time, or to Room W12–140, DOT Building, 1200 New Jersey Ave. SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Background

FMCSA has authority under 49 U.S.C. 31315 and 31136(e) to grant exemptions from certain parts of the FMCSRs. The Agency is required to publish a notice of each exemption request in the **Federal Register** [49 CFR 381.315(a)]. FMCSA must provide the public an opportunity to inspect the information relevant to the application. The Agency must also provide an opportunity for public comment on the request. FMCSA reviews the public comments and determines whether granting the exemption would be likely to achieve a level of safety equivalent to or greater than the level of safety that would be obtained in the absence of the exemption (49 CFR 381.305). The decision of the Agency must be published in the **Federal Register** with the reasons for denying or granting the application [49 CFR 381.315(b) and (c)].

Application for Exemption

Timberdoodle uses commercial motor vehicles (CMVs) to transport its products to conferences and conventions, where it sells them. It wants to use its CMV drivers as salespersons at these events, but the definition of ''on duty time'' in 49 CFR 395.2 requires that both the driving time and the sales time of its drivers be treated as ''on duty time.'' The result is that Timberdoodle's drivers are frequently ineligible to drive its CMVs because they have exceeded the limit of 60 hours on duty in a period of 7 consecutive days. Timberdoodle asked for exemption from Section 395.3(b)(1) and proposed that its drivers be prohibited from operating a CMV only after they accumulate 60 hours of *driving* time in any 7-day period. Thus, ''on duty/not driving'' time would be removed from the calculation of total hours on duty in a 7-day period. A copy of Timberdoodle's application for exemption is in Docket FMCSA–2013–0069.

Public Comments

On May 3, 2013, FMCSA published notice of this application and asked for public comment (78 FR 26104). Four individuals and Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety submitted comments. All opposed the application for exemption.

Agency Decision

FMCSA reviewed Timberdoodle's application and the public comments. By letter dated December 9, 2013, FMCSA denied the application because the Agency concluded Timberdoodle's operations were not likely to achieve a level of safety equivalent to or greater than the level of safety that would be achieved in the absence of the exemption [49 CFR 381.310(c)(5)]. Its drivers could accumulate up to 98 hours of on-duty (driving and not driving) time in a 7-day period before other HOS rules would bar their operation of a CMV.

Timberdoodle did not offer any measures to offset the excessive driver fatigue that would no doubt be generated by such a schedule. Further, while Timberdoodle may prefer to operate in the manner outlined in its application, other practical approaches to its convention sales that would not require its CMV drivers to exceed the on-duty limits of 49 CFR 395.3(b)(1) may be available. A copy of the denial letter is in Docket FMCSA–2013–0069.

Issued on: April 1, 2014.

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2014–07805 Filed 4–7–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

[Docket Number FRA–2004–17989]

Petition for Waiver of Compliance

In accordance with part 211 of Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this document provides the public notice that by a document dated January 29, 2014, Canadian Pacific Railway (CP) has petitioned the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) for a renewal of its waiver of compliance from certain provisions of the Federal railroad safety regulations contained in 49 CFR part 218, Subpart B, Blue Signal Protection of Workers. FRA assigned the petition Docket Number FRA–2004–17989.

CP seeks renewal of its relief from 49 CFR Section 218.22(c)(5), *Utility employee.* This section lists the functions allowed to be performed by a utility employee without establishing blue signal protection. Although the employee under this section is allowed to remove or replace an end-of-train (EOT) telemetry device, FRA has maintained that removing or replacing a battery in an EOT, while the device is in place on the rear of the train, requires Blue Signal Protection because this task is a service and repair to the device. The present relief allows operating craft utility employees to change out EOT batteries as long as the changeout does not require the use of a tool. CP states that in the 8 years since the original waiver was granted, it has not recorded any accidents or incidents related to this waiver and hereby submits its petition for continued relief.

A copy of the petition, as well as any written communications concerning the petition, is available for review online at *www.regulations.gov* and in person at the U.S. Department of Transportation's (DOT) Docket Operations Facility, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., W12–140, Washington, DC 20590. The Docket Operations Facility is open from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.

Interested parties are invited to participate in these proceedings by submitting written views, data, or comments. FRA does not anticipate scheduling a public hearing in connection with these proceedings since the facts do not appear to warrant a hearing. If any interested party desires an opportunity for oral comment, they should notify FRA, in writing, before the end of the comment period and specify the basis for their request.

All communications concerning these proceedings should identify the appropriate docket number and may be