

Mahan Air

Also Known As: Mahan Air Co.
Location:

- (a) No. 21, Mahan Air Tower, Azadegan Street, Jenah Expressway, Beginning of Sheykh Fazlollah Exp. Way, First of Karaj High Way, Tehran, 1481655761, Iran (Islamic Republic of)
- (b) Mahan Air Tower, 21st Floor, Azadeghan Street, Karaj Highway, P.O. Box 14515–411, Tehran, Iran (Islamic Republic of)
- (c) Mahan Air Tower, Azadegan St., Karaj Highway, P.O. Box 411–14515, Tehran, 1481655761, Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Gonzalo O. Suarez,

*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary,
International Security and Non-Proliferation,
Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 2020–00815 Filed 1–17–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–27–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**Federal Highway Administration**

**Rescinding the Notice of Intent for an
Environmental Impact Statement:
Washington and Benton Counties,
Arkansas**

AGENCY: Federal Highway
Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Rescind Notice of Intent (NOI)
to prepare an Environmental Impact
Statement (EIS).

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that the NOI for the preparation of an EIS to study a proposed intermodal highway project in Washington and Benton Counties, Arkansas is being rescinded. The NOI was published in the **Federal Register** on February 4, 2000, and a draft EIS was released in October 2012. This rescission is based on important changes in the existing infrastructure that allows for a substantially reduced scope of work.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Peter A. Jilek, FHWA—Acting Division Administrator, Arkansas Division Office, 700 West Capitol Ave., Rm. 3130, Little Rock, AR 72201–3298; 501–324–5625; fax: 501–324–6423.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA in cooperation with the Arkansas Department of Transportation and the Northwest Regional Airport Authority, initiated a study to identify a new intermodal access road to the Northwest Regional Airport. The project was studied as a toll facility connecting the Northwest Regional Airport to either US 71 (currently I–49) or US 412 for

approximately eight to twelve miles. A preferred alternative was not determined. The NOI for the previously notified EIS is being rescinded due to important infrastructure changes affecting the originally proposed alternatives. With the upgrade of US 71 to I–49 and the construction of the Northern Springdale Bypass the scale of the project, the range of alternatives, and the potential for significant impacts is substantially reduced. The reduced scope allows for a separate project to be completed that will satisfy the purpose and need and would likely be studied as an Environmental Assessment.

Comments and questions concerning the proposed action should be directed to the FHWA contact person at the address provided above.

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

Issued on: January 9, 2010.

Peter A. Jilek,

*Acting Division Administrator, Little Rock,
AR.*

[FR Doc. 2020–00900 Filed 1–17–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–RY–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

**Federal Motor Carrier Safety
Administration**

[Docket No. FMCSA–2019–0048]

**California’s Meal and Rest Break Rules
for Drivers of Passenger-Carrying
Commercial Motor Vehicles; Petition
for Determination of Preemption**

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

ACTION: Order; grant of petition for
determination of preemption.

SUMMARY: The FMCSA grants the petition submitted by the American Bus Association (ABA) requesting a determination that the State of California’s Meal and Rest Break rules (MRB rules) are preempted under 49 U.S.C. 31141 as applied to passenger-carrying commercial motor vehicle drivers subject to FMCSA’s hours of service regulations. Federal law provides for preemption of State laws on commercial motor vehicle safety that are additional to or more stringent than Federal regulations if they (1) have no safety benefit; (2) are incompatible with Federal regulations; or (3) would cause an unreasonable burden on interstate commerce. The FMCSA has determined that California’s MRB rules are laws on commercial motor vehicle (CMV) safety, that they are more stringent than the Agency’s hours of service regulations,

that they have no safety benefits that extend beyond those already provided by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations, that they are incompatible with the Federal hours of service regulations, and that they cause an unreasonable burden on interstate commerce. The California MRB rules, therefore, are preempted under 49 U.S.C. 31141(c).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Charles J. Fromm, Deputy Chief Counsel, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590, (202) 493–0349; email *Charles.Fromm@dot.gov*.

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> 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.

Privacy Act: Anyone may search the FDMS for 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 DOT’s Privacy Act Statement for the FDMS published in the **Federal Register** on December 29, 2010. 75 FR 82132.

Background

On January 10, 2019, ABA petitioned FMCSA to preempt California statutes and rules requiring employers to give their employees meal and rest breaks during the work day, as applied to drivers of passenger-carrying CMVs subject to FMCSA’s hours of service (HOS) regulations. For the reasons set forth below, FMCSA grants the petition.

California Meal and Rest Break Rules

Section 512, Meal periods, of the California Labor Code reads, in part, as follows:

“(a) An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the