

State and location	Community No.	Effective date authorization/cancellation of sale of flood insurance in community	Current effective map Date	Date certain federal assistance no longer available in SFHAs
Taft, Town of, Muskogee County .....	400128	June 26, 1976, Emerg; August 25, 1987, Reg; February 4, 2011, Susp.	.....do* .....	Do.
Wainwright, Town of, Muskogee County	400129	March 9, 1976, Emerg; August 8, 1978, Reg; February 4, 2011, Susp.	.....do* .....	Do.
Warner, Town of, Muskogee County ....	400130	December 29, 1976, Emerg; May 25, 1978, Reg; February 4, 2011, Susp.	.....do* .....	Do.
Webbers Falls, Town of, Muskogee County.	400131	November 28, 1975, Emerg; May 1, 1980, Reg; February 4, 2011, Susp.	.....do* .....	Do.
Texas:				
Bandera County, Unincorporated Areas	480020	January 21, 1974, Emerg; November 1, 1978, Reg; February 4, 2011, Susp.	.....do* .....	Do.
Benavides, City of, Duval County .....	480792	July 24, 1975, Emerg; March 4, 1986, Reg; February 4, 2011, Susp.	.....do* .....	Do.
Colorado County, WCID Number 2 .....	481489	October 28, 1977, Emerg; June 1, 1988, Reg; February 4, 2011, Susp.	.....do* .....	Do.
Colorado County, Unincorporated Areas	480144	February 29, 1980, Emerg; September 19, 1990, Reg; February 4, 2011, Susp.	.....do* .....	Do.
Columbus, City of, Colorado County ....	480145	February 19, 1975, Emerg; June 19, 1985, Reg; February 4, 2011, Susp.	.....do* .....	Do.
Duval County, Unincorporated Areas ....	480202	July 24, 1975, Emerg; May 1, 1987, Reg; February 4, 2011, Susp.	.....do* .....	Do.
Eagle Lake, City of, Colorado County ...	480146	July 30, 1975, Emerg; April 1, 1987, Reg; February 4, 2011, Susp.	.....do* .....	Do.
Lamesa, City of, Dawson County .....	480191	February 25, 1972, Emerg; April 30, 1976, Reg; February 4, 2011, Susp.	.....do* .....	Do.
San Diego, City of, Duval and Jim Wells Counties.	481199	December 26, 1975, Emerg; March 1, 1987, Reg; February 4, 2011, Susp.	.....do* .....	Do.

\*-do- = Ditto.

Code for reading third column: Emerg.—Emergency; Reg.—Regular; Susp.—Suspension.

Dated: January 19, 2011.

**Sandra K. Knight,**

*Deputy Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administrator, Mitigation.*

[FR Doc. 2011-1930 Filed 1-27-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110-12-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Office of the Secretary**

**49 CFR Part 26**

[Docket No. OST-2010-0118]

**RIN 2105-AD75**

**Disadvantaged Business Enterprise: Program Improvements**

**AGENCY:** Office of the Secretary (OST), DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This rule improves the administration of the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) program by increasing accountability for recipients with respect to meeting overall goals, modifying and updating certification requirements, adjusting the personal net worth (PNW) threshold for inflation, providing for expedited interstate certification, adding provisions to foster small business participation, improving

post-award oversight, and addressing other issues.

**DATES: Effective Dates:** This rule is effective February 28, 2011.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Robert C. Ashby, Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulation and Enforcement, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590, Room W94-302, 202-366-9310, [bob.ashby@dot.gov](mailto:bob.ashby@dot.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Department of Transportation issued an advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM) concerning several DBE program issues on April 8, 2009 (74 FR 15904). The first issue raised in the ANPRM concerned counting of items obtained by a DBE subcontractor from its prime contractor. The second concerned ways of encouraging the “unbundling” of contracts to facilitate participation by small businesses, including DBEs. The third was a request for comments on potential improvements to the DBE application form and personal net worth (PNW) form. The fourth asked for suggestions related to program oversight. The fifth concerned potential regulatory action to facilitate certification for firms seeking to work as DBEs in more than one state.

The sixth concerned additional limitations on the discretion of prime contractors to terminate DBEs for convenience, once the prime contractor had committed to using the DBE as part of its showing of good faith efforts. The Department received approximately 30 comment letters regarding these issues.

On May 10, 2010, the Department issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) seeking further comment on proposals based on the ANPRM and proposing new provisions (75 FR 25815). The NPRM proposed an inflationary adjustment of the PNW cap to \$1.31 million, the figure that would result from proposed Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) reauthorization legislation then pending in both Houses of Congress. The Department proposed additional measures to hold recipients accountable for their performance in achieving DBE overall goals.

The NPRM also proposed amendments to the certification-related provisions of the DBE regulation. Those proposals resulted from the Department’s experience dealing with certification issues and certification appeal cases during the years since the last major revision of the DBE rule in 1999. The proposed amendments were intended to clarify issues that have arisen and avoid problems with which

recipients (*i.e.*, state highway agencies, transit authorities, and airport sponsors who receive DOT grant financial assistance) and the Department have had to grapple over the last 11 years.

The Department received approximately 160 comments on the NPRM from a variety of interested parties, including DBE and non-DBE firms, associations representing them, and recipients of DOT financial assistance. A summary of comments on the major issues in the rulemaking, and the Department's responses to those comments, follows.

### Counting Purchases From Prime Contractors

Under current counting rules, a DBE subcontractor and its prime contractor may count for DBE credit the entire cost of a construction contract, including items that the DBE subcontractor purchases or leases from a third party (*e.g.*, in a so-called "furnish and install" contract). There is an exception to this general rule: A DBE and its prime contractor may not count toward goals items that the DBE purchases or leases from its own prime contractor. The reason for this provision is that doing so would allow the prime contractor to count for DBE credit items that it produced itself.

As noted in the ANPRM, one DBE subcontractor and a number of prime contractors objected to this approach, saying that it unfairly denies a DBE in this situation the opportunity to count credit for items it has obtained from its prime contractor rather than from other sources. Especially in situations in which a commodity might only be available from a single source—a prime contractor or its affiliate—the rule would create a hardship, according to proponents of this view. The ANPRM proposed four options (1) keeping the rule as is; (2) keeping the basic rule as is, but allowing recipients to make exceptions in some cases; (3) allowing DBEs to count items purchased from any third party source, including the DBE's prime contractor; and (4) not allowing any items obtained from any non-DBE third party to be counted for DBE credit. Comment was divided among the four alternatives, which each garnering some support. For purposes of the NPRM, the Department decided not to propose any change from the current rule.

Comment on the issue was again divided. Seven commenters favored allowing items obtained from any source to be counted for credit, including the firm that was the original proponent of the idea and another DBE, two prime contractors' associations, a

prime contractor, and two State Departments of Transportation (DOTs). These commenters generally made the same arguments as had proponents of this view at the ANPRM stage. Thirteen commenters, among which were several recipients, a DBE contractors' association, and DBE contractors, favored the NPRM's proposed approach of not making any change to the existing rule, and they endorsed the NPRM's rationale. Sixteen commenters, including a recipient association and a number of DBE companies, supported disallowing credit for any items purchased or leased from a non-DBE source. They believed that this approach supported the general principle of awarding DBE credit only for contributions that DBEs themselves make on a contract.

### DOT Response

The Department remains unconvinced that it is appropriate for a prime contractor to produce an item (*e.g.*, asphalt), provide it to its own DBE subcontractor, and then count the value of the item toward its good faith efforts to meet DBE goals. The item—asphalt, in this example—is a contribution to the project made by the prime contractor itself and simply passed through the DBE. That is, the prime contractor, on paper, sells the item to the DBE, who then charges the cost of the item it just bought from the prime contractor as part of its subcontract price, which the prime then reports as DBE participation. In the Department's view, this pass-through relationship is inconsistent with the most important principle of counting DBE participation, which is that credit should only be counted for value that is added to the transaction by the DBE itself.

As mentioned in the ANPRM and NPRM, the current rule treats counting of items purchased by DBEs from non-DBE sources differently, depending on whether the items are obtained from the DBE's prime contractor or from a third-party source. The Department's current approach is a reasonable compromise between the commonly accepted practice of obtaining items from non-DBE sources as part of the contracting process and maintaining the principle of counting only the DBE's own contributions for credit toward goals, which is most seriously violated when the prime contractor itself is the source of the items. This compromise respects the dual, somewhat divergent, goals of accommodating a common way of doing business and avoiding a too-close relationship between a prime contractor and a DBE subcontractor that distorts the counting of credit toward DBE goals.

This compromise has been part of the regulation since 1999 and, with the exception of the proponent of changing the regulation and its prime contractor partners, has never been raised by program participants as a widespread problem requiring regulatory change. For these reasons, the Department will leave the existing regulatory language intact.

### Terminations of DBE Firms

The NPRM proposed that a prime contractor who, in the course of meeting its good faith efforts requirements on a procurement involving a contract goal, had submitted the names of one or more DBEs to work on the project, could not terminate a DBE firm without the written consent of the recipient. The firm could be terminated only for good cause. The NPRM proposed a list of what constituted good cause for this purpose.

Over 40 comments addressed this subject, a significant majority of which supported the proposal. Two recipients said the proposal was unnecessary and a third expressed concern about workload implications. Several recipients said that they already followed this practice.

However, commenters made a variety of suggestions with respect to the details of the proposal. A DBE firm questioned a good cause element that would allow a firm to be terminated for not meeting reasonable bonding requirements, noting that lack of access to bonding is a serious problem for many DBEs. A DBE contractors' association said that a DBE's action to halt performance should not necessarily be a ground for termination, because in some cases such an action could be a justified response to an action beyond its control (*e.g.*, the prime failing to make timely payments). A DBE requested clarification of what being "not responsible" meant in this context. A number of commenters, including recipients and DBEs, suggested that a prime could terminate a DBE only if the DBE "unreasonably" failed to perform or follow instructions from the prime.

A prime contractors' association suggested additional grounds for good cause to terminate, including not performing to schedule or not performing a commercially useful function. Another such association said the rule should be consistent with normal business practices and not impede a prime contractor's ability to remove a poorly performing subcontractor for good cause. A recipient wanted a public safety exception to the time frame for a DBE's reply to a prime contractor's notice

proposing termination, and another recipient wanted to shorten that period from five to two days. A State unified certification program (UCP) suggested adopting its State's list of good cause reasons, and a consultant suggested that contracting officers, not just the DBE Liaison Officer (DBELO), should be involved in the decision about whether to concur in a prime contractor's desire to terminate a DBE. A recipient wanted to add language concerning the prime contractor's obligation to make good faith efforts to replace a terminated DBE with another DBE.

#### DOT Response

The Department, like the majority of commenters on this issue, believes that the proposed amendment will help to prevent situations in which a DBE subcontractor, to which a prime contractor has committed work, is arbitrarily dismissed from the project by the prime contractor. Comments to the docket and in the earlier stakeholder sessions have underlined that this has been a persistent problem. By specifying that a DBE can be terminated only for good cause—not simply for the convenience of the prime contractor—and with the written consent of the recipient, this amendment should help to end this abuse.

With respect to the kinds of situations in which “good cause” for termination can exist, the Department has modified the language of the rule to say that good cause includes a situation where the DBE subcontractor has failed or refused to perform the work of its subcontract in accordance with normal industry standards. We note that industry standards may vary among projects, and could be higher for some projects than others, a matter the recipient could take into account in determining whether to consent to a prime contractor's proposal to terminate a DBE firm. However, good cause does not exist if the failure or refusal of the DBE subcontractor to perform its work on the subcontract results from the bad faith or discriminatory action of the prime contractor (e.g., the failure of the prime contractor to make timely payments or the unnecessary placing of obstacles in the path of the DBE's work).

Good cause also does not exist if the prime contractor seeks to terminate a DBE it relied upon to obtain the contract so that it can self-perform the work in question or substitute another DBE or non-DBE firm. This approach responds to commenters who were concerned about prime contractors imposing unreasonable demands on DBE subcontractors while offering recipients a more definite standard than simple

reasonableness in deciding whether to approve a prime contractor's proposal to terminate a DBE firm. We have also adopted a recipient's suggestion to permit the time frame for the process to be shortened in a case where public necessity (e.g., safety) requires a shorter period of time before the recipient's decision.

In addition to the enumerated grounds, a recipient may permit a prime contractor to terminate a DBE for “other documented good cause that the recipient determines compels the termination of the DBE subcontractor.” This means that the recipient must document the basis for any such determination, and the prime contractor's reasons for terminating the DBE subcontractor make the termination essential, not merely discretionary or advantageous. While the recipient need not obtain DOT operating administration concurrence for such a decision, FHWA, FTA, and FAA retain the right to oversee such determinations by recipients.

#### Personal Net Worth

The NPRM proposed to make an inflationary adjustment in the personal net worth (PNW) cap from its present \$750,000 to \$1.31 million, based on the consumer price index (CPI) and relating back to 1989, as proposed in FAA authorization bills pending in Congress. The NPRM noted that such an adjustment had long been sought by DBE groups and that it maintained the status quo in real dollar terms. The Department also asked for comment on the issue of whether assets counted toward the PNW calculation should continue to include retirement savings products. The rule currently does include them, but the pending FAA legislation would move in the direction of excluding them from the calculation.

Of the 95 commenters who addressed the basic issue of whether the Department should make the proposed inflationary adjustment, 71—representing all categories of commenters—favored doing so. Many said that such an adjustment was long overdue and that it would mitigate the problem of a “glass ceiling” limiting the growth and development of DBE firms. A few commenters said that such adjustments should be done regionally or locally rather than nationally, to reflect economic differences among areas of the country. A number of the commenters wanted to make sure the Department made similar adjustments annually in the future. A member of Congress suggested that the PNW should be increased to \$2.5 million, while a few recipients favored a smaller

increase (e.g., to \$1 million). A few commenters also suggested that the Department explore some method of adjusting PNW other than the CPI, but they generally did not spell out what the alternative approaches might be.

The opponents of making the adjustment, mostly recipients and DBEs, made several arguments. The first was that \$1.31 million was too high and would include businesses owners who were not truly disadvantaged. The second was that raising the PNW number would favor larger, established, richer DBEs at the expense of smaller, start-up firms. These larger companies could then stay in the program longer, to the detriment of the program's aims. Some commenters said that the experience in their states was that very few firms were becoming ineligible for PNW reasons, suggesting that a change in the current standard was unnecessary.

With respect to the issue of retirement assets, about 28 comments, primarily from DBE groups and recipients, favored excluding some retirement assets from the PNW calculation, often asserting that this was appropriate because such funds are illiquid and not readily available to contribute toward the owners' businesses. Following this logic, some of the comments said that Federally-regulated illiquid retirement plans (e.g., 401k, Roth IRA, Keough, and Deferred Compensation plans, as well as 529 college savings plans) be excluded while other assets that are more liquid (CDs, savings accounts) be counted, even if said to be for retirement purposes. A number of these commenters said that a monetary cap on the amount that could be excluded (e.g., \$500,000) would be acceptable.

The 17 comments opposing excluding retirement accounts from the PNW calculation generally supported the rationale of the existing regulation, which is that assets of this kind, even if illiquid, should be regarded as part of an individual's wealth for PNW purposes. A few commenters also said that, since it is most likely wealthier DBE owners who have such retirement accounts, excluding them would help these more established DBEs at the expense of smaller DBEs who are less likely to be able to afford significant retirement savings products. Again, commenters said that this provision, by effectively raising the PNW cap, would inappropriately allow larger firms to stay in the program longer. Some of the commenters would accept exclusion of retirement accounts if an appropriate cap were put in place, however.

Finally, several commenters asked for a revised and improved PNW form with

additional guidance and instructions on how to make PNW calculations (*e.g.*, with respect to determining the value of a house or business).

#### DOT Response

To understand the purpose and effect of the Department's proposal to change the PNW threshold from the long-standing \$750,000 figure, it is important to keep in mind what an inflationary adjustment does. (Because of the passage of time from the issuance of the NPRM to the present time, the amount of the inflationary adjustment has changed slightly, from \$1.31 million to \$1.32 million.) The final rule's adjustment is based on the Department of Labor's consumer price index (CPI) calculator. This calculator was used because, of various readily available means of indexing for inflation, CPI appears to be the one that is most nearly relevant to an individual's personal wealth. Such an adjustment simply keeps things as they were originally in real dollar terms.

That is, in 1989, \$750,000 bought a certain amount of goods and services. In 2010, given the effects of inflation over 21 years, it would take \$1.32 million in today's dollars to buy the same amount of goods and services. The buying power of assets totaling \$750,000 in 1989 is the same as the buying power of assets totaling \$1.32 million in 2010. Notwithstanding the fact that \$1.32 million, on its face, is a higher number than \$750,000, the wealth of someone with \$1.32 million in assets today is the same, in real dollar or buying power terms, as that of someone with \$750,000 in 1989.

Put another way, if the Department did not adjust the \$750,000 number for inflation, our inaction would have the effect of establishing a significantly lower PNW cap in real dollar terms. A PNW cap of \$750,000 in 2010 dollars is equivalent to a PNW cap of approximately \$425,700 in 1989 dollars. This means that a DBE applicant today would be allowed to have \$325,000 less in real dollar assets than his or her counterpart in 1989.

The Department believes, in light of this understanding of an inflationary adjustment, that making the proposed adjustment at this time is appropriate. This is a judgment that is shared by the majority of commenters and both Houses of Congress. We do not believe that any important policy interest is served by continuing to lower the real dollar PNW threshold, which we believe would have the effect of further limiting the pool of eligible DBE owners beyond what is intended by the Department in adopting the PNW standard.

The Department is using 1989 as the base year for its inflationary adjustment for two reasons. First, doing so is consistent with what both the House and Senate determined was appropriate in the context of FAA authorization bills that both chambers passed. Second, while the Department adopted a PNW standard in 1999, the standard itself, which was adopted by the Small Business Administration (SBA) before 1989, has never been adjusted for inflation at any time. By 1999, the real dollar value of the original \$750,000 standard had already been eroded by inflation, and the Department believes that it is reasonable to take into account the effect of inflation on the standard that occurred before as well as after the Department adopted it.

We appreciate the concerns of commenters who opposed the proposed inflationary adjustment. Some of these commenters, it appears, may not have fully understood that an inflationary adjustment simply maintains the status quo in real dollar terms. The concern that making the adjustment would favor larger, established DBEs over smaller, start-up companies has some basis, and reflects the longstanding tension in the program between its role as an incubator for new firms and its purpose of allowing DBE firms to grow and develop to the point where they may be in a better position to compete for work outside the DBE program. Allowing persons with larger facial amounts of assets may seem to permit participation of people who are less disadvantaged than formerly in the program, but disadvantage in the DBE program has always properly been understood as relative disadvantage (*i.e.*, relative to owners and businesses in the economy generally), not absolute deprivation. People who own successful businesses are more affluent, by and large, than many people who participate in the economy only as employees, but this does not negate the fact that socially disadvantaged persons who own businesses may well, because of the effects of discrimination, accumulate less wealth than their non-socially disadvantaged counterparts. Consequently, the concerns of opponents of this change are not sufficient to persuade us to avoid making the proposed inflationary adjustment.

We do not believe that it is practical, in terms of program administration, to have standards that vary with recipient or region. We acknowledge that one size may not fit all to perfection, but the complexity of administering a national program with a key eligibility standard that varies, perhaps significantly, among

jurisdictions would be, in our view, an even greater problem. Nor do we see a strong policy rationale for a change to some fixed figure (*e.g.*, \$1 million, \$2.5 million) that is not tied to inflation. We do agree, however, that an improved PNW form would be an asset to the program, and we will propose such a form for comment in the next stage NPRM on the DBE program, which we hope to issue in 2011. This NPRM may also continue to examine other PNW issues.

Whenever there is a change in a rule of this sort, the issue of how to handle the transition between the former rule and the new rule inevitably arises. We provide the following guidance for recipients and firms applying for DBE certification.

- For applications or decertification actions pending on the date this amendment is published, but before its effective date, recipients should make decisions based on the new standards, though these decisions should not take effect until the amendment's effective date.

- Beginning on the effective date of this amendment, all new certification decisions must be based on the revised PNW standard, even if the application was filed or a decertification action pertaining to PNW began before this date.

- If a denial of an application or decertification occurred before the publication date of this amendment, because the owner's PNW was above \$750,000 but not above \$1.32 million, and the matter is now being appealed within the recipient's or unified certification program's (UCP's) process, then the recipient or UCP should resolve the appeal using the new standard. Recipients and UCPs may request updated information where relevant. In the case of an appeal pending before the Departmental Office of Civil Rights (DOCR) under section 26.89, DOCR will take the same approach or remand the matter, as appropriate.

- If a firm was decertified or its application denied within a year before the effective date of this amendment, because the owner's PNW was above \$750,000 but not above \$1.32 million, the recipient or UCP should permit the firm to resubmit PNW information without any further waiting period, and the firm should be recertified if the owner's PNW is not over \$1.32 million and the firm is otherwise eligible.

- We view any individual who has misrepresented his or her PNW information, whether before or after the inflationary adjustment takes effect, as having failed to cooperate with the DBE

program, in violation of 49 CFR 26.109(c). In addition to other remedies that may apply to such conduct, recipients should not certify a firm that has misrepresented this information.

The Department is not ready, at this time, to make a decision on the issue of retirement assets. The comments suggested a number of detailed issues the Department should consider before proposing any specific provisions on this subject. We will further consider commenters' thoughts on this issue at a future time.

### Interstate Certification

In response to longstanding concerns of DBEs and their groups, the NPRM proposed a mechanism to make interstate certification easier. The proposed mechanism did not involve pure national reciprocity (*i.e.*, in which each state would give full faith and credit to other states' certification decisions, with the result that a certification by any state would be honored nationwide). Rather, it created a rebuttable presumption that a firm certified in its home state would be certified in other states. A firm certified in home state A could take its application materials to State B. Within 30 days, State B would decide either to accept State A's certification or object to it. If it did not object, the firm would be certified in State B. If State B did object, the firm would be entitled to a proceeding in which State B bore the burden of proof to demonstrate that the firm should not be certified in State B. The NPRM also proposed that the DOT Departmental Office of Civil Rights (DOCR) would create a database that would be populated with denials and decertifications, which the various State UCPs would check with respect to applicants and currently certified firms.

This issue was one of the most frequently commented-upon subjects in the rulemaking. Over 30 comments, from a variety of sources including DBEs, DBE organizations, and a prime contractors' association. Members of Congress and others supported the proposed approach. They emphasized that the necessity for repeated certification applications to various UCPs, and the very real possibility of inconsistent results on the same facts, were time-consuming, burdensome, and costly for DBEs. In a national program, they said, there should be national criteria, uniformity of forms and interpretations, and more consistent training of certification personnel. The proposed approach, they said, while not ideal, would be a useful step toward those goals.

An approximately equal number of commenters, predominantly recipients but also including some DBEs and associations, opposed the proposal, preferring to keep the existing rules (under which recipients can, but are not required to, accept certifications made by other recipients) in place. Many of these commenters said that their certification programs frequently had to reject out-of-state firms that had been certified by their home states because the home states had not done a good job of vetting the qualifications of the firms for certification. They asserted that there was too much variation among states concerning applicable laws and regulations (*e.g.*, with respect to business licensing or marital property laws), interpretations of the DBE rule, forms and procedures, and the training of certifying agency personnel for something like the NPRM proposal to work well. Before going to something like the NPRM proposal, some of these commenters said, DOT should do more to ensure uniform national training, interpretations, forms etc.

Commenters opposed to the NPRM proposal were concerned that the integrity of the program would be compromised, as questionable firms certified by one state would slip into the directories of other states without adequate vetting. Moreover, the number of certification actions each state had to consider, and the number of certified firms that each state would have to manage, could increase significantly, straining already scarce resources.

A smaller number of commenters addressed the idea of national reciprocity. Some of these commenters said that, at least for the future, national reciprocity was a valuable goal to work toward. Some of these commenters, including an association that performs certification reviews nationally for MBE and WBE suppliers (albeit without on-site reviews) and a Member of Congress, supported using such a model now. On the other hand, other commenters believed national reciprocity was an idea whose time had not come, for many of the same reasons stated by commenters opposed to the NPRM proposal. Some of the commenters on the NPRM proposal said that the proposal would result in *de facto* national reciprocity, which they believed was bad for the program.

Two features of the NPRM proposal attracted considerable adverse comment. Thirty-one of the 34 comments addressing the proposed 30-day window for "State B" to decide whether to object to a home state certification of a firm said that the proposed time was too short. These

commenters, mostly recipients, suggested time frames ranging from 45–90 days. They said that the 30-day time frame would be very difficult to meet, given their resources, and would cause States to accept questionable certifications from other States simply because there was insufficient time to review the documentation they had been given. Moreover, the 30-day window would mean that out-of-state firms would jump to the front of the line for consideration over in-state firms, concerning which the rule allows 90 days for certification. This would be unfair to in-state firms, they said.

In addition, 22 of 28 commenters on the issue of the burden of proof for interstate certification—again, predominantly recipients—said that it was the out-of-state applicant firm, rather than State B, that should have the burden of proof once State B objected to a home state certification of the firm. These commenters also said that it is more sensible to put the out-of-state firm in the same position as any other applicant for certification by having to demonstrate to the certifying agency that it was eligible, rather than placing the certification agency in the position of the proponent in a decertification action for a firm that it had previously certified. Again, commenters said, the NPRM proposal would favor out-of-state over in-state applicants.

A few comments suggested trying reciprocal certification on a regional basis (*e.g.*, in the 10 Federal regions) before moving to a more national approach. Others suggested that only recent information (*e.g.*, applications and on-site reports less than three years old) be acceptable for interstate certification purposes. Some states pointed to state laws requiring local licenses or registration before a firm could do business in the State: Some commenters favored limiting out-of-state applications to those firms that had obtained the necessary permits, while one commenter suggested prohibiting States from imposing such requirements prior to DBE certification. Some comments suggested limiting the grounds on which State B could object to the home state certification of a firm (*i.e.*, "good cause" rather than "interpretive differences," differences in state law, evidence of fraud in obtaining home state certification).

There was a variety of other comments relevant to the issue of interstate certification. Most commenters who addressed the idea of the DOCR database supported it, though some said that denial/decertification data should be available only to certification agencies, not the general

public. Some also said that having to input and repeatedly check the data base would be burdensome. One commenter suggested including a firm's Federal Taxpayer ID number in the database entry. One commenter suggested a larger role for the database: Applicants should electronically input their application materials to the database, which would then be available to all certifying agencies, making individual submissions of application information to the States unnecessary. Some commenters wanted DOT to create or lead a national training and/or accreditation effort for certifier personnel.

### DOT Response

Commenters on interstate were almost evenly divided on the best course of action for the Department to take. Most DBEs favored making interstate certification less difficult for firms that wanted to work outside their home states; most recipients took the opposite point of view. This disagreement reflects, we believe, a tension between two fundamental objectives of the program. On one hand, it is important to facilitate the entry of DBE firms into this national program, so that they can compete for DOT-assisted contracting wherever those opportunities exist, while reducing administrative burdens and costs on the small businesses that seek to participate. On the other hand, it is important to maintain the integrity of the program, so that only eligible firms participate and ineligible firms do not take unfair advantage of the program.

The main concern of proponents of the NPRM proposal was that failing to make changes to facilitate interstate certification would leave in place unnecessary and unreasonable barriers to the participation of firms outside of their home states. The main concern of opponents of the NPRM proposal was that making the proposed changes would negatively affect program integrity. Their comments suggest that there is considerable mistrust among certification agencies and programs. Many commenters appear to believe that, while their own certification programs do a good job, other states' certification programs do not. Much of the opposition to facilitating interstate certification appears to have arisen from this mistrust, as certification agencies seek to prevent questionable firms certified by what they perceive as weak certification programs in other states from infiltrating their domains.

The Department does not believe that it is constructive to take the position that certification programs nationwide

are so hopelessly inadequate that the best response is to leave interstate barriers in place to contain the perceived contagion of poorly qualified, albeit certified, firms within the boundaries of their own states. To the contrary, we believe that, under a system like that proposed in the NPRM, if firms certified by State A are regularly rebuffed by States B, C, D, etc., State A firms will have an incentive to bring pressure on their certification agency to improve its performance.

The Department also believes that suggestions made by commenters, such as improving training and standardizing forms and interpretations, can improve the performance of certification agencies generally. In the follow-on NPRM the Department hopes to issue in 2011, one of the subjects we will address is improvements in the certification application and PNW forms, which certification agencies then would be required to use without alteration. DOT already provides many training opportunities to certification personnel, such as the National Transportation Institute courses provided by the Federal Transit Administration, presentations by knowledgeable DOT DBE staff at meetings of transportation organizations, and webinars and other training opportunities provided by Departmental Office of Civil Rights personnel. The Department will consider further ways of fostering training and education for certifiers (e.g., a DOT-provided web-based training course for certifiers). The Department also produces guidance on certification-related issues to assist certifiers in making decisions that are consistent with this regulation, and we will continue that practice.

While we will continue to work with our state and local partners to improve the certification process, we do not believe that steps to facilitate interstate certification should be taken only after all recipients achieve an optimal level of performance. The DBE program is a national program; administrative barriers to participation impair the important program objective of encouraging DBE firms to compete for business opportunities; provisions to facilitate interstate certification can be drafted in a way that permits "State B" to screen out firms that are not eligible in accordance with this regulation. Consequently, the Department has decided to proceed with a modified form of the NPRM proposal. However, the final rule will not make compliance with the new section 26.85 mandatory until January 1, 2012, in order to provide additional time for recipients and UCPs to take advantage of training

opportunities and to establish any needed administrative mechanisms to carry out the new provision. This will also provide time for DOCR to make its database for denials and decertifications operational.

As under the NPRM, a firm certified in its home state would present its certification application package to State B. In response to commenters' concerns about the time available, State B would have 60 days, rather than 30 as in the NPRM, to determine whether it had specific objections to the firm's eligibility and to communicate those objections to the firm. If State B believed that the firm was ineligible, State B would state, with particularity, the specific reasons or objections to the firm's eligibility. The firm would then have the opportunity to respond and to present information and arguments to State B concerning the specific objections that State B had made. This could be done in writing, at an in-person meeting with State B's decision maker, or both. Again in response to commenters' concerns, the firm, rather than State B, would have the burden of proof with respect, and only with respect, to the specific issues raised by State B's objections. We believe that these changes will enhance the ability of certification agencies to protect the integrity of the program while also enhancing firms' ability to pursue business opportunities outside their home states.

We emphasize that State B's objections must be specific, so that the firm can respond with information and arguments focused clearly on the particular issues State B has identified, rather than having to make an unnecessarily broad presentation. It is not enough for State B to say "the firm is not controlled by its disadvantaged owner" or "the owner exceeds the PNW cap." These are conclusions, not specific, fact-based objections. Rather, State B might say "the disadvantaged owner has a full-time job with another organization and has not shown that he has sufficient time to exercise control over the day-to-day operations of the firm" or "the owner's property interests in assets X, Y, and Z were improperly valued and cause his PNW to exceed \$1.32 million." This degree of specificity is mandatory regardless of the regulatory ground (e.g., new information, factual errors in State A's certification: See section 26.85(d)(2)) on which State B makes an objection. For example, if State B objected to the firm's State A certification on the basis that State B's law required a different result, State B would say something like "State B Revised Statutes Section xx.yyyy

provides only that a registered engineer has the power to control an engineering firm in State B, and the disadvantaged owner of the firm is not a registered engineer, who is therefore by law precluded from controlling the firm in State B.”

On receiving this specific objection, the owner of the firm would have the burden of proof that he or she does meet the applicable requirements of Part 26. In the first example above, the owner would have to show that either he or she does not now have a full-time job elsewhere or that, despite the demands of the other job, he or she can and does control the day-to-day operations of the firm seeking certification. This burden would be to make the required demonstration by a preponderance of the evidence, the same standard used for initial certification actions generally. This owner would not bear any burden of proof with respect to size, disadvantage, ownership, or other aspects of control, none of which would be at issue in the proceeding. The proceeding, and the firm’s burden of proof, would concern only matters about which State B had made a particularized, specific objection. This narrowing of the issues should save time and resources for firms and certification agencies alike.

The firm’s response to State B’s particularized objections could be in writing and/or in the form of an in-person meeting with State B’s decision maker to discuss State B’s objections to the firm’s eligibility. The decision maker would have to be someone who is knowledgeable about the eligibility provisions of the DBE rule.

We recognize that, in unusual circumstances, the information the firm provided to State B in response to State B’s specific objections could contain new information, not part of the original record, that could form the basis for an additional objection to the firm’s certification. In such a case, State B would immediately notify the firm of the new objection and offer the firm a prompt opportunity to respond.

Section 26.85(d)(2) of the final rule lists the grounds a State B can rely upon to object to a State A certification of a firm. These are largely the same as in the NPRM. In response to a comment, the Department cautions that by saying that a ground for objection is that State A’s certification is inconsistent with this regulation, we do not intend for mere interpretive disagreements about the meaning of a regulatory provision to form a ground for objection. Rather, State B would have to cite something in State A’s certification that contradicted

a provision in the regulatory text of Part 26.

The final rule also gives, as a ground for objecting to a State A certification, that a State B law “requires” a result different from the law of State (*see* the engineering example above). To form the basis for an objection on this ground, a difference between state laws must be outcome-determinative with respect to a certification. For example, State A may treat marital property as jointly held property, while State B is a community property state. The laws are different, but both, in a given case, may well result in each spouse having a 50 percent share of marital assets. This would not form the basis for a State B objection.

With respect to state requirements for business licenses, the Department believes that states should not erect a “Catch 22” to prevent DBE firms from other states from becoming certified. That is, if a firm from State A wants to do business in State B as a DBE, it is unlikely to want to pay a fee to State B for a business license before it knows whether it will be certified. Making the firm get the business license and pay the fee before the certification process takes place would be an unnecessary barrier to the firm’s participation that would be contrary to this regulation.

The Department believes that regional certification consortia, or reciprocity agreements among states in a region, are a very good idea, and we anticipate working with UCPs in the future to help create such arrangements. Among other things, the experience of actually working together could help to mitigate the current mistrust among certification agencies. However, we do not believe it would be appropriate to mandate such arrangements at this time.

The Department believes that the DOCR database of decertification and denial actions would be of great use in the certification process. However, the system is not yet up and running. Consequently, the final rule includes a one-year delay in the implementation date of requirements for use of the database.

#### Other Certification-Related Issues

The NPRM asked for comment on whether there should be a requirement for periodic certification reviews and/or updates of on-site reviews concerning certified firms. The interval most frequently mentioned by commenters on this subject was five years, though there was also some support for three-, six-, and seven-year intervals. A number of commenters suggested that such reviews should include an on-site update only when the firm’s circumstances had

changed materially, in order to avoid burdening the limited resources of certifying agencies. Having a standardized on-site review form would reduce burdens, some commenters suggested. Other commenters suggested that the timing of reviews should be left to certifying agencies’ discretion, or that on-site updates should be done on a random basis of a smaller number of firms.

The NPRM also asked about the handling of situations where an applicant withdraws its application before the certifying agency makes a decision. Should certifying agencies be able to apply the waiting period (*e.g.*, six or 12 months) used for reapplications after denials in this situation? Comments on this issue, mostly from recipients but also from some DBEs and their associations, were divided. Some commenters said that there were often good reasons for a firm to withdraw and correct an application (*e.g.*, a new firm unaccustomed to the certification process) and that their experience did not suggest that a lot of firms tried to game the system through repeated withdrawals. On the other hand, some commenters said that having to repeatedly process withdrawn and resubmitted applications was a burden on their resources that they would want to mitigate through applying a reapplication waiting period. One recipient said that, even in the absence of a waiting period, the resubmitted application should go to the back of the line for processing. Still others wanted to be able to apply case-by-case discretion concerning whether to impose a waiting period on a particular firm. A few commenters suggested middle-ground positions, such as imposing a shorter waiting period (*e.g.*, 90 days) than that imposed on firms who are denied or applying a waiting period only for a second or subsequent withdrawal and reapplication by the same firm.

Generally, commenters were supportive of the various detail-level certification provision changes proposed in the NPRM (*e.g.*, basing certification decisions on current circumstances of a firm). Commenters did speak to a wide variety of certification issues, however. One commenter said that in its state, the UCP arbitrarily limited the number of NAICS codes in which a firm could be certified, a practice the commenter said the regulation should forbid. In addition, this commenter said, the UCP inappropriately limited certification of professional services firms owned by someone who was not a licensed professional in a field, even in the

absence of a state law requiring such licensure. A number of commenters said that recipients should not have to automatically certify SBA-certified 8(a) firms, while another commenter recommended reviving the now-lapsed DOT-SBA memorandum of understanding (MOU) on certification issues. A DBE association said that certifying agencies should not count against firms seeking certification (e.g., with respect to independence determinations) investments from or relationships with larger firms that are permitted under other Federal programs (e.g., HubZone or other SBA programs). One commenter favored, and another opposed, allowing States to use their own business specialty classifications in addition to or in lieu of NAICS codes.

One recipient recommended a provision to prevent owners from transferring personal assets to their companies to avoid counting them in the PNW calculation. Another said the certification for the PNW statement should specifically say that the information is "complete" as well as true. Yet another suggested that a prime contractor who owns a high percentage (e.g., 49 percent) of a DBE should not be able to use that DBE for credit. There were a number of suggestions that more of the certification process be done electronically, rather than on paper. A few comments said that getting back to an applicant within 20 days, as proposed in the NPRM, concerning whether the application was complete was too difficult for some recipients who have small staffs.

#### DOT Response

The Department believes that regularly updated on-site reviews are an extremely important tool in helping avoid fraudulent firms or firms that no longer meet eligibility requirements from participating in the DBE program. Ensuring that only eligible firms participate is a key part of maintaining the integrity of the program. We also realize that on-site reviews can be time- and resource-intensive. Consequently, while we believe that it is advisable for recipients and UCPs to conduct updated on-site reviews of certified companies on regular and reasonably frequent basis, and we strongly encourage such undated reviews, we have decided not to mandate a particular schedule, though we urge recipients to regard on-site reviews as a critical part of their compliance activities. When recipients or UCPs become aware of a change in circumstances or concerns that a firm may be ineligible or engaging in misconduct (e.g., from notifications of changes by the firm itself, complaints,

information in the media, etc.), the recipient or UCP should review the firm's eligibility, including doing an on-site review.

When recipients in other states (see discussion of interstate certification above) obtain the home state's certification information, they must rely on the on-site report that the home state has in its files plus the affidavits of no change, etc. that the firm has filed with the home state. It is not appropriate for State B to object to an out-of-state firm's certification because the home state's on-site review is older than State B thinks desirable, since that would unfairly punish a firm for State A's failure to update the firm's on-site review. However, if an on-site report is more than three years old, State B could require that the firm provide an affidavit to the effect that all the facts in the report remain true and correct.

While we recognize that reports that have not been updated, or which do not appear to contain sufficient analysis of a firm's eligibility, make certification tasks more difficult, our expectation is that the Department's enhanced interstate certification process will result in improved quality in on-site reviews so that recipients in various states have a clear picture of the structure and operation of firms and the qualifications of their owners. To this end, we encourage recipients and UCPs to establish and maintain communication in ways that enable information collected in one state to be shared readily with certification agencies in other states. This information sharing can be done electronically to reduce costs.

Firms may withdraw pending applications for certification for a variety of reasons, many of them legitimate. A withdrawal of an application is not the equivalent of a denial of that application. Consequently, we believe that it is inappropriate for recipients and UCPs to penalize firms that withdraw pending applications by applying the up-to-12 month waiting period of section 26.86(c) to such withdrawals, thereby preventing the firm from resubmitting the application before that time elapses. We believe that permitting recipients to place resubmitted applications at the end of the line for consideration sufficiently protects the recipients' workloads from being overwhelmed by repeated resubmissions. For example, suppose that Firm X withdraws its application in August. It resubmits the application in October. Meanwhile, 20 other firms have submitted applications. The recipient must accept Firm X's resubmission in October, but is not

required to consider it before the 20 applications that arrived in the meantime. Recipients should also closely examine changes made to the firm since the time of its first application.

We agree with commenters that it is not appropriate for recipients to limit NAICS codes in which a firm is certified to a certain number. Firms may be certified in NAICS codes for however many types of business they demonstrate that they perform and concerning which their disadvantaged owners can demonstrate that they control. We have added language to the regulation making this point. We also agree that it is not appropriate for a recipient or UCP to insist on professional certification as a *per se* condition for controlling a firm where state law does not impose such a requirement. We have no objection to a recipient or UCP voluntarily using its own business classification system in addition to using NAICS codes, but it is necessary to use NAICS codes.

SBA has now gone to a self-certification approach for small disadvantaged business, the SBA 8(a) program differs from the DBE program in important respects, and the SBA-DOT memorandum of understanding (MOU) on certification matters lapsed over five years ago. Under these circumstances, we have decided to delete former sections 26.84 and 26.85, relating to provisions of that MOU.

DBE firms in the DBE program must be fully independent, as provided in Part 26. If a firm has become dependent on a non-DBE firm through participation in another program, then it may be found ineligible for DBE program purposes. To say otherwise would create inconsistent standards that would enable firms already participating in other programs to meet a lower standard than other firms for DBE participation.

We believe that adding a regulatory provision prohibiting owners from transferring personal assets to their companies to avoid counting them in the PNW calculation would be difficult to implement, since owners of businesses often invest assets in the companies for legitimate reasons. However, as an interpretive matter, recipients are authorized to examine such transfers and, if they conclude that the transfer is a ruse to avoid counting personal assets toward the PNW calculation rather than a legitimate investment in the company and its growth, recipients or UCPs may continue to count the assets toward PNW.

We agree that the certification for the PNW statement should specifically say



that the information is “complete” as well as true and that a somewhat longer time period would be appropriate for recipients and UCPs to get back to applicants with information on whether their applications were complete. We have added a regulatory text statement on the former point and extended the time period on the latter point to 30 days.

If a prime contractor who owns a high percentage of a DBE that it wishes to use on a contract, issues concerning independence, affiliation, and commercially useful function can easily arise. For this reason, recipients should closely scrutinize such relationships. This scrutiny may well result, in some cases, in denying DBE credit or initiating decertification action.

We encourage the use of electronic methods in the application and certification process. As in other areas, electronic methods can reduce administrative burdens and speed up the process.

#### Accountability and Goal Submissions

The NPRM proposed that if a recipient failed to meet its overall goal, it would, within 60 days, have to analyze the shortfall, explain the reasons for it, and come up with corrective actions for the future. All State DOTs and the largest transit authorities and airports would have to send their analyses and corrective action plans to DOT operating administrations; smaller transit authorities and airports would retain them on file. While there would not be any requirement to meet a goal—to “hit the number”—failure to comply with these requirements could be regarded as a failure to implement a recipient’s program in good faith, which could lead to a finding of noncompliance with the regulation.

In a related provision, the Department asked questions in the NPRM concerning the recent final provision concerning submitting overall goals on a three-year, rather than an annual, basis. In particular, the NPRM asked whether it should be acceptable for a recipient to submit year-to-year projections of goals within the structure of a three-year goal and how implementation of the accountability proposal would work in the context of a three-year goal, whether or not year-to-year projections were made.

About two-thirds of the 64 comments addressing the accountability provision supported it. These commenters included DBEs, recipients, and some associations and other commenters. Some of these commenters, in fact, thought the proposal should be made

stronger. For example, a commenter suggested that a violation “will” rather than “could” be found for failure to provide the requested information. Another suggested that, beyond looking at goal attainment numbers, the accountability provisions should be broadened to include the recipient’s success with respect to a number of program elements (e.g., good faith efforts on contracts, outreach, DBE liaison officer’s role, training and education of staff).

Commenters also presented various ideas for modifying the proposal. These included suggestions that the Department should add a public input component, provide more guidance on the shortfall analysis and how to do it, delay its effective date to allow recipients to find resources to comply, ensure ongoing measurement of achievements rather than just measuring at the end of a year or three-year period, ensure that there is enough flexibility in explaining the reasons for a shortfall, or lengthen the time recipients have to submit the materials (e.g., 90 days, or 60 days after the recipient’s report of commitments and achievements is due). One commenter suggested that an explanation should be required only when there is a pattern of goal shortfalls, not in individual instances. There could be a provision for excusing recipients who fell short of their goal by very small amount, or even if the recipient made 80 percent of its goal.

Opponents of the proposal—mostly recipients plus a few associations—said that the proposal would be too administratively burdensome. In addition, they feared that making recipients explain a shortfall and propose corrective measures would turn the program into a prohibited set-aside or quota program, a concern that was particularly troublesome in states affected by the *Western States* decision. Moreover, a number of commenters said, the inability of recipients to meet overall goals was often the result of factors beyond their control. In addition, recipients might unrealistically reduce goals in order to avoid having to explain missing a more ambitious target.

With respect to the reporting intervals for goals, 28 of the 39 commenters who addressed the issue favored some form of at least optional yearly reporting of goals, either in the form of annual goal submissions or, more frequently, of year-to-year projections of goals within the framework of a three-year overall goal. The main reason given for this preference was a concern that projects and the availability of Federal funding for them were sufficiently volatile that making a projection that was valid for

a three-year period was problematic. This point of view was advanced especially by airports. Some other commenters favored giving recipients discretion whether to report annually or triennially. Commenters who took the point of view that the three-year interval was preferable agreed with original rationale of reducing repeated paperwork burdens on recipients. One commenter asked that the rule specify that, especially in a three-year interval schedule of goal submission, a recipient “must” submit revisions if circumstances change.

There was discussion in the NPRM of the relationship between the goal submission interval and the accountability provision. For example, if a recipient submitted overall goals on a three-year basis, would the accountability provision be triggered annually, based on the recipient’s annual report (as the NPRM suggested) or only on the basis of the recipient’s performance over the three-year period? If there were year-to-year projections within a three-year goal, would the accountability provision relate to accountability for the annual projection or the cumulative three-year goal? Commenters who favored year-to-year projections appeared to believe that accountability would best relate to each year’s projection, though the discussion of this issue in the comments was often not explicit. Some comments, including one from a Member of Congress, did favor holding recipients accountable for each year’s separate performance.

There was a variety of other comments on goal-related issues. Some commenters asked that the three DOT operating administrations coordinate submitting goals so that a State DOT submitting goals every three years would be able to submit its FHWA, FAA, and FTA goals in the same year. A DBE group wanted the Department to strengthen requirements pertaining to the race-neutral portion of a recipient’s overall goal. A commenter who works with transit vehicle manufacturers requested better monitoring of transit vehicle manufacturers by FTA. A group representing DBEs wanted recipients to focus on potential, and not just certified, DBEs for purposes of goal setting. The same group also urged consideration of separate goals for minority- and women-owned firms.

#### DOT Response

Under Part 26, the Department has always made unmistakably clear that the DBE program does not impose quotas. No one ever has been, or ever will be, sanctioned for failing to “hit the number.” However, goals must be

implemented in a meaningful way. A recipient's overall goal represents its estimate of the DBE participation it would achieve in the absence of discrimination and its effects. Failing to meet an overall goal means that the recipient has not completely remedied discrimination and its effects in its DOT-assisted contracting. In the Department's view, good faith implementation of a DBE program by a recipient necessarily includes understanding why the recipient has not completely remedied discrimination and its effects, as measured by falling short of its "level playing field" estimate of DBE participation embodied in its overall goal. Good faith implementation further means that, having considered the reasons for such a shortfall, the recipient will devise program actions to help minimize the potential for a shortfall in the future.

Under the Department's procedures for reviewing overall goals and the methodology supporting them, the Department has the responsibility of ensuring that a recipient's goals are well-grounded in relevant data and are derived using a sound methodology. The Department would not approve a recipient's goal submission if it appeared to understate the "level playing field" amount of DBE participation the recipient could rationally expect, whether to avoid being accountable under the new provisions of the rule or for other reasons.

For these reasons, the Department is adopting the NPRM's proposed accountability mechanism. We do not believe that the concerns of some commenters that this mechanism would create a quota system are justified: No one will be penalized for failing to meet an overall goal. Moreover, promoting transparency and accountability is not synonymous with imposing a penalty and should not be viewed as such. Understanding the reasons for not meeting a goal and coming up with ways of avoiding a shortfall in the future, while not creating a quota system, do help to ensure that recipients take seriously the responsibility to address discrimination and its effects.

Moreover, the administrative burden of compliance falls only on those recipients who fail to meet a goal, not on all recipients. Understanding what is happening in one's program, why it is happening, and how to fix problems is, or ought to be, a normal, everyday part of implementing a program, so the analytical tasks involved in meeting this requirement should not be new to recipients. We do not envision that recipients' responses to this requirement

would be book-length; a reasonable succinct summary of the recipient's analysis and proposed actions should be sufficient though, like all documents submitted in connection with the DBE program, it should show the work and reasoning leading to the recipient's conclusions.

For example, a recipient might determine that its process for ascertaining whether prime bidders who failed to meet contract goals had made adequate good faith efforts was too weak, and that prime bidders consequently received contracts despite making insufficient efforts to find DBEs for contracts. In such a case, the recipient could take corrective action such as more stringent review of bidder submissions or meeting with prime bidders to provide guidance and assistance on how to do a better job of making good faith efforts.

We agree that there may be circumstances in which a recipient's inability to meet a goal is for reasons beyond its control. If that is the case, the recipient's response to this requirement can be to identify such factors, as well as suggesting how these problems may be taken into account and surmounted in the future. We also agree with those commenters who said that good-faith implementation of a DBE program involves more than meeting an overall goal. Factors like those cited by commenters are important as part of an overall evaluation of a recipient's success. This accountability provision, however, is intended to focus on the process recipients are using to achieve their overall goals, rather than to act as a total program evaluation tool. The operating administrations will continue to conduct program reviews that address the breadth of recipients' program implementation.

The Department believes that a clear, bright-line trigger for the application of the accountability provision makes the most sense administratively and in terms of achieving the purpose of the provision. Consequently, we are not adopting suggestions that the provision be triggered only by a pattern of missing goals, or an average of missing goals over the period of a three-year overall goal, or a shortfall of a particular percentage. Any shortfall means that a recipient has dealt only incompletely with the effects of discrimination, and we believe that it is appropriate in any such case that the recipient understand why that is the case and what steps to take to improve program implementation in the future.

The three-year goal review interval was intended to reduce administrative burdens on recipients. Nevertheless, we

understand that some recipients, especially airports, may be more comfortable with annual projections and updates of overall goals. We have no objection to recipients making annual projections, for informational purposes, within the three-year overall goal. It is still the formally submitted and reviewed three-year goal, however, and not the informal annual projections, that count from the point of view of the accountability mechanism. For example, suppose an airport has a three-year annual overall goal of 12 percent. For informational purposes, the airport chooses to make informal annual projections of 6, 12, and 18 percent for years 1–3, respectively (which, by the way, are not required to be submitted to the Department). The accountability mechanism requirements would be triggered in each of the three years covered by the overall goal if DBE achievements in each year were less than 12 percent.

The Department agrees that recipients should be accountable for effectively carrying out the race-neutral portion of their programs. If a recipient fell short of its overall goal because it did not achieve the projected race-neutral portion of its goal, then this is something the recipient would have to explain and establish measures to correct (*e.g.*, by stepping up race-neutral efforts and/or concluding that it needed to increase race-conscious means of achieving its goal). We also agree that it is reasonable, in calculating goals and in doing disparity studies, to consider potential DBEs (*e.g.*, firms apparently owned and controlled by minorities or women that have not been certified under the DBE program) as well as certified DBEs. This is consistent with good practice in the field as well as with DOT guidance. Separate goals for various groups of disadvantaged individuals are possible with a program waiver of the DBE regulation, if a sufficient case is made for the need for group-specific goals.

In the section of the rule concerning goal-setting (49 CFR 26.45), the Department is also taking this opportunity to make a technical correction. In the final rule establishing the three year DBE goal review cycle, the Department inadvertently omitted from § 26.45(f)'s regulatory text paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), which govern the content of goal submissions, operating administration review of the submission, and review of interim goal setting mechanisms. It was never the intent of the Department to remove or otherwise change those provisions of section 26.45(f) of the rule. This final rule corrects that error by restructuring

paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 26.45(f) and restoring the language of paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) of that section of the rule. We apologize for any confusion that this error may have caused.

The Department supports strong outreach efforts by recipients to encourage minority- and women-owned firms to become certified as DBEs, so that recipients can set and meet realistic goals. However, we caution recipients against stating or implying that minority- and women-owned firms can participate in recipients' contracts only if they become certified as DBEs. It would be contrary to nondiscrimination requirements of this part and of Title VI for a recipient to limit the opportunity of minority- or women-owned firms to compete for any contract because the firm was not a certified DBE.

### Program Oversight

The NPRM proposed to require recipients to certify that they have monitored the paperwork and on-site performance of DBE contracts to make sure that DBEs actually perform them. Comment was divided on this proposal, with 21 comments favoring either the proposal or stronger oversight mechanisms and 18 opposed.

Commenters who favored the proposal, including DBEs and some associations and recipients, generally believed that the provision would make it less likely that post-award abuse of DBEs by prime contractors would occur. One recipient noted that it already followed this approach with respect to ARRA grants. Some commenters wanted the Department to require additional steps, such as requiring recipients to make periodic visits to the job site and keeping records of each visit, to ensure that the DBELO did in fact have direct access to the organization's CEO concerning DBE matters, and to maintain sufficient trained staff to do needed monitoring. DBE associations wanted mandatory monitoring of good faith efforts (e.g., by keeping records of all contacts made by prime contractors) and terminations of DBEs by prime contractors, as well as to have certifications signed by persons higher up in the organization than the DBELO (e.g., the CEO). Another commenter sought further checking concerning counting issues. A consultant and a recipient suggested that recipient certifications should be more frequent than a one-time affair, (e.g., monthly or quarterly).

Commenters who opposed the NPRM proposal, most of whom were recipients, said that the workload the certification requirement would create would be too administratively

burdensome, particularly for recipients with small staffs. The certification requirement could duplicate existing commercially useful function reviews. They also doubted the payoff in terms of improved DBE program implementation would be worth the effort. Some recipients said that they did monitor post-award performance and that the proposed additional paperwork requirement step would add little to the substance of their processes. One recipient noted that it would be very difficult to perform an on-site review of contract performance in the case of professional services consultants whose work was performed out of state.

One recipient suggested that a middle ground might be to have the recipient certify monitoring of a sample of contracts, since it lacked the staff for field monitoring of all contracts. A consultant suggested selecting contracts for monitoring based on a "risk-based analysis" of contracts or by focusing on contracts where prime contractors' achievements did not measure up to their commitments. One recipient suggested limiting the certification requirement to one commercially useful function review per year on a contract. A few recipients asked for guidance on what constituted adequate staffing for the DBE program.

### DOT Response

The Department's DBE rule already includes a provision (49 CFR 26.37(b)) requiring recipients to have a monitoring and enforcement mechanism to ensure that work committed to DBEs is actually performed by DBEs. The trouble is that, based on the Department's experience, this provision is not being implemented by recipients as well as it should be. The FHWA review team that has been examining state implementation of the DBE program found that many states did not have an effective compliance monitoring program in place. DBE fraud cases investigated by the Department's Office of Inspector General and criminal prosecutions in the Federal courts have highlighted numerous cases in which recipients were unaware, often for many years, of situations in which non-DBE companies were claiming DBE credit for work that DBEs did not perform.

The Department believes that, for the DBE program to be meaningful, it is not enough that prime contractors commit to the use of DBEs at the time of contract award. It is also necessary that the DBEs actually perform the work involved. Recipients need to know whether DBEs are actually performing the work involved, lest program effectiveness suffer and the door be left open to fraud.

Recipients must actually monitor each contract, on paper and in the field, to ensure that they have this knowledge. Monitoring DBE compliance on a contract is no less important, and should be no more brushed aside, than compliance of with project specifications. This is important for prime contracts performed by DBEs as well as for situations in which DBEs act as subcontractors, and the monitoring and certification requirements will apply to both situations.

Consequently, the Department believes that the proposed requirement that recipients memorialize the monitoring they are already required to perform has merit. Its intent is to make sure that the monitoring actually takes place and that the recipient stands by the statement that DBE participation claimed on a contract actually occurred. This monitoring, and the recipient's written certification that it took place, must occur with respect to every contract on which DBE participation is claimed, not just a sample or percentage of such contracts, to make sure that the program operates as it is intended. It applies to contracts entered into prior to the effective date of this rule, since the obligation to monitor work performed by DBEs has always been a key feature of the DBE program.

With respect to concerns about administrative burden, the Department believes that monitoring is something that recipients have been responsible for conducting since the inception of Part 26. Therefore, we are not asking recipients to do something with which they can claim they are unfamiliar. Moreover, as the final rule version of this provision makes clear, recipients can combine the on-site monitoring for DBE compliance with other monitoring they do. For example, the inspector who looks at a project to make sure that the contractor met contract specifications before final payment is authorized could also confirm that DBE requirements were honestly met.

While we believe that more intensive and more frequent monitoring of DBE performance on contracts is desirable, we encourage recipients to monitor contracts as closely as they can. However, we do not, for workload reasons, want to mandate more pervasive monitoring at this time. We agree with commenters that it would be difficult to do on-site monitoring of contracts performed outside the state (e.g., an out-of-state consulting contract), and we have added language specifying that the requirement to monitor work sites pertains to work sites in the recipient's state. In reference to what constitutes adequate staffing of

a DBE program, we believe that it is best to look at this question in terms of a performance standard. The Department's rule requires certain tasks (e.g., responding to applications for DBE eligibility, certification and monitoring of DBE performance on contracts) to be performed within certain time frames. If a recipient has sufficient staff to meet these requirements, then its staffing levels are adequate. If not (e.g., applications for DBE certification are backlogged for several months), then staffing is inadequate.

### Small Business Provisions

The NPRM proposed that recipients would add an element to their DBE programs to foster small business participation in contracts. The purpose of this proposal was to encourage programs that, by facilitating small business participation, augmented race-neutral efforts to meet DBE goals. The program element could include items such as race-neutral small business set-asides and unbundling provisions. The NPRM did not propose to mandate any specific elements, however.

The majority of commenters addressing this part of the NPRM—38 of 55—favored the NPRM's approach. Commenters approving the proposal were drawn from DBEs, associations, and recipients. Generally, they agreed that steps to create improved opportunities for small business would help achieve the objectives of the DBE program. Specific elements that various commenters supported included unbundling (which some commenters suggested should be made mandatory), prohibiting double-bonding, small business set-asides, expansions of existing small business development programs and mentor-protégé programs.

Commenters who did not support the NPRM proposal, most of whom were recipients, were concerned that having small business programs would draw focus from programs targeted more directly at DBEs. They were also concerned about having sufficient resources to carry out the programs they might include in a small business program element. One commenter thought that a small business program element would duplicate existing supportive services programs. Another thought unbundling would not work. A number of recipients thought it would be better for DOT to issue guidance on this subject rather than to create regulatory language. A recipient association characterized the proposal as burdensome and not productive.

Eight commenters addressed the issue of bonding and insurance requirements. A bonding company association

explained that both performance and payment bonds had an appropriate place in contracting and believed that subcontractor bonds were not duplicative of prime contractor bonds. A DBE wanted to prohibit prime contractors from setting bonding requirements for subcontractors. A recipient said the Department should treat prime contractors and subcontractors the same for bonding purposes. One DBE association said the combination of payment bonds, performance bonds, and retention was burdensome for subcontractors and Another DBE association said that it was inappropriate to require bonding of the subcontractor when the prime contractor was already bonded for the overall work of the contract. This association suggested that a prime contractor could not demonstrate good faith efforts to meet a goal if it insisted on such a double bond.

### DOT Response

DBEs are small businesses. Program provisions that help small businesses can help DBEs. By facilitating participation for small businesses, recipients can make possible more DBE participation, and participation by additional DBE firms. Consequently, we believe that a program element that pulls together the various ways that a recipient reaches out to small businesses and makes it easier for them to compete for DOT-assisted contracts will foster the objectives of the DBE program. Because small business programs of the kind suggested in the NPRM are race-neutral, use of these programs can assist recipients in meeting the race-neutral portions of their overall goals. This is consistent with the language that under Part 26, recipients are directed to meet as much as possible of their overall goals through race-neutral means.

It is important to keep in mind that race-neutral programs should not be passive. Simply waiting and hoping that occasional DBEs will participate without the use of contract goals does not an effective race-neutral program make. Rather, recipients are responsible for taking active, effective steps to increase race-neutral DBE participation, by implementing programs of the kind mentioned in this section of the NPRM and final rule. The Department will be monitoring recipients' race-neutral programs to make sure that they meet this standard.

In adopting the NPRM proposal requiring a small business program element, the Department believes that this element—which is properly viewed as an integral part of a recipient's DBE

program—need not distract recipients from other key parts of recipients' DBE programs, such as certification and the use of race-conscious measures. There are different ways of encouraging DBE participation and meeting DBE overall goals, and recipients' programs need to address a variety of these means. Many of the provisions that recipients can use to implement the requirements of the new section (e.g., unbundling, race-neutral small business set-asides) are already part of the regulation or DOT guidance, and carrying out these elements should not involve extensive additional burdens.

With respect to bonding, the Department believes that commenters made a good point with respect to the burden of duplicative bonding. By duplicative bonding, we mean insistence by a prime contractor that a DBE provide bonding for work that is already covered by bonding or insurance provided by the prime contractor or the recipient. Like duplicative bonding, excessive bonding—a requirement, which according to participants in the Department's stakeholder meetings, is sometimes imposed to provide a bond in excess of the value of the subcontractor's work—can act as an unnecessary barrier to DBE participation. While we believe that additional action to address these problems may have merit, there was not a great deal of comment on the implications of potential regulatory requirements in these areas. Consequently, we will defer action on these issues at this time and seek additional comment and information in the follow-on NPRM the Department is planning to issue.

### Miscellaneous Comments

Several commenters expressed general support for the DBE program and/or the NPRM, while two commenters opposed the DBE program in general. A large number of comments from an advocacy organization's members supported additional bonding assistance and more frequent data reporting. A commenter wanted to add DBE coverage for Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) grants. Commenters also suggested such steps as increasing technical assistance, using project labor agreements to increase DBE participation, an SBA 8(a) program-like term limit on participation in the DBE program, a better uniform reporting form, greater ease in complaining to DOT and recipients about noncompliance issues, and putting current joint check guidance into the rule's text.

## DOT Response

The Department already has programs in place concerning bonding and data reporting. There is not currently a direct, specific statutory mandate for a DBE program in FRA financial assistance programs, though the Department is considering ways of ensuring nondiscrimination in contracting in these programs. For example, like all recipients of Federal financial assistance, FRA recipients are subject to requirements under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Existing programs, such as the FHWA supportive services program and various initiatives by the Department's Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, are in place to assist DBEs in being competitive. Given the language of the statutes authorizing the DOT DBE program, we do not believe that a term limit on the participation of DBE companies would be permissible. The Department is working on improvements on all its DBE forms, and we expect to seek comment on revised forms in the follow-on NPRM we anticipate publishing. At this point, we think that the joint check guidance is sufficient without codification, but we can look at this issue, among other certification issues, in the next round of rulemaking.

## The Continuing Compelling Need for the DBE Program

As numerous court decisions have noted,<sup>1</sup> the Department's DBE regulations, and the statutes authorizing them, are supported by a compelling need to address discrimination and its effects. This basis for the program has been established by Congress and applies on a nationwide basis. Both the House and Senate FAA reauthorization bills contained findings reaffirming the compelling need for the program. We would also call to readers' attention the additional information presented to the House of Representatives in a March 26, 2009, hearing before the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and made a part of the record of that hearing and a Department of Justice document entitled "The Compelling Interest for Race- and Gender-Conscious Federal Contracting Programs: A Decade Later An Update to the May 23, 1996 Review of Barriers for Minority- and Women-

Owned Businesses" and the information and documents cited therein. This information confirms the continuing compelling need for race- and gender-conscious programs such as the DOT DBE program.

## Regulatory Analyses and Notices

### *Executive Order 12866 and DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures*

This is a nonsignificant regulation for purposes of Executive Order 12866 and the Department of Transportation's Regulatory Policies and Procedures. Its provisions involve administrative modifications to several provisions of a long-existing and well-established program, designed to improve the program's implementation. The rule does not alter the direction of the program, make major policy changes, or impose significant new costs or burdens.

### *Regulatory Flexibility Act*

A number of provisions of the rule reduce small business burdens or increase opportunities for small business, notably the interstate certification process and the small business DBE program element provisions. Small recipients would not be required to file reports concerning the reasons for overall goal shortfalls and corrective action steps to be taken. Only State DOTs, the 50 largest transit authorities, and the 30–50 airports receiving the greatest amount of FAA financial assistance would have to file these reports. The task of sending copies of on-site review reports to other certification entities fall on UCPs, which are not small entities, and in any case can be handled electronically (*e.g.*, by emailing PDF copies of the documents). While all recipients would have to input information about decertifications and denials into a DOT database, this would be a quick electronic process that would not be costly or burdensome. In any case, this requirement will be phased in as the Department prepares to put the database online. The rule does not make major policy changes that would cause recipients to expend significant resources on program modifications. For these reasons, the Department certifies that the rule does not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities.

### *Federalism*

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on State or local governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of

compliance on them. We have analyzed this rule under the Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism, since it merely makes administrative modifications to an existing program. It does not change the relationship between the Department and State or local governments, pre-empt State law, or impose substantial direct compliance costs on those governments.

### *Paperwork Reduction Act*

As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, DOT has submitted the Information Collection Requests (ICRs) below to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Before OMB decides whether to approve these proposed collections of information and issue a control number, the public must be provided 30 days to comment. Organizations and individuals desiring to submit comments on the collections of information in this rule should direct them to the Office of Management and Budget, *Attention*: Desk Officer for the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Washington, DC 20503. OMB is required to make a decision concerning the collection of information requirements contained in this rule between 30 and 60 days after publication of this document in the **Federal Register**. Therefore, a comment is best assured of having its full effect if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication.

We will respond to any OMB or public comments on the information collection requirements contained in this rule. The Department will not impose a penalty on persons for violating information collection requirements which do not display a current OMB control number, if required. The Department intends to obtain current OMB control numbers for the new information collection requirements resulting from this rulemaking action. The OMB control number, when assigned, will be announced by separate notice in the **Federal Register**.

It is estimated that the total incremental annual burden hours for the information collection requirements in this rule are 47,450 hours in the first year, 83,370 in the second year, and 51,875 thereafter. The following are the information collection requirements in this rule:

Certification of Monitoring (49 CFR 26.37(b))

Each recipient would certify that it had conducted post-award monitoring of contracts which would be counted for

<sup>1</sup> See for instance *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Slater*, 228 F.3d 1147 (10th Cir. 2000), *Northern Contracting Inc. v. Illinois Department of Transportation*, 473 F.3d 715 (7th Cir. 2007), *Sherbrooke Turf, Inc. v. Minnesota Department of Transportation*, 345 F.3d 964 (8th Cir. 2003), *Western States Paving Co., Inc. v. Washington Department of Transportation*, 407 F.3d 983 (9th Cir. 2005).

DBE credit to ensure that DBEs had done the work for which credit was claimed. The certification is for the purpose of ensuring accountability for monitoring which the regulation already requires.

*Respondents:* 1,050.

*Frequency:* 13,400 (i.e., there are about 13,400 contracts per year that have DBE participation, based on 2009 data).

*Estimated Burden per Response:* 1/2 hour.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden:* 6,700 hours.

Small Business Program Element (49 CFR 26.39)

Each recipient would add a new DBE program element, consisting of strategies to encourage small business participation in their contracting activities. No specific element would be required, and many of the potential elements are already part of the existing DBE regulation or implementing guidance (e.g., unbundling; race-neutral small business set-asides). The small business program element is intended to pull a recipient's small business efforts into a single, unified place in this DBE Program. This requirement goes into effect a year from the effective date of the rule.

*Respondents:* 1,050.

*Frequency:* Once (for a one-time task).

*Estimated Burden per Response:* 30 hours.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 31,500 (one time).

Accountability Mechanism (49 CFR 26.47(c))

If a recipient failed to meet its overall goal in a given year, it would have to determine the reasons for its failure and establish corrective steps.

Approximately 150 large recipients would transmit this analysis to DOT; smaller recipients would perform the analysis but would not be required to submit it to DOT. We estimate that about half of recipients would be subject to this requirement in a given year.

*Respondents:* 525 (150 of which would have to submit reports to DOT).

*Frequency:* Once per year.

*Estimated Average Burden per Response:* 80 hours + 5 for recipients sending report to DOT.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 42,750.

Affidavit of Completeness (49 CFR 26.45(c)(4))

When a firm certified in its home state seeks certification in another state ("State B"), the firm must provide an affidavit that the information the firm

provides to State B is complete and is identical to that submitted to the home state. The calculation of the burden for this item assumes that there will be an average 2600 interstate applications each year to which this requirement would apply. This requirement takes effect a year from the effective date of this rule.

*Respondents:* 2,600.

*Frequency:* Once per year to a given recipient.

*Estimated Average Burden per Response:* 1 hour.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 2,600 hours.

Transmittal of On-Site Report (49 CFR 26.85(d)(1))

When a "State B" receives a request for certification from a firm certified in "State A," State A must promptly send a copy of that report to State B. This would involve simply emailing a PDF or other electronic copy of an existing report. This requirement takes effect one year from the effective date of this rule.

*Respondents:* 52.

*Frequency:* An average of 50 per year per recipient.

*Estimated Average Burden per Response:* 1/2 hour.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 1,300.

Transmittal of Decertification/Denial Information (49 CFR 26.85(f)(1))

When a unified certification program (UCP) in a state denies a firm's application for certification or decertifies the firm, it must electronically notify a DOT database of the fact. The information in the database is then available to other certification agencies for their reference. The calculation of the burden of this requirement assumes that there would be an average of 100 such actions per year by each UCP.

*Respondents:* 52.

*Frequency:* An average of 100 per year per recipient.

*Estimated Average Burden per Response:* 1/2 hour.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 2,600.

Transmittal of Denial/Decertification Documents (49 CFR 26.85(f)(3))

When a UCP notes, from the DOT database, that a firm that has applied or been granted certification was denied or decertified elsewhere, the UCP would request a copy of the decision by the other state, which would then have to send a copy. The Department anticipates that this would be done by an email exchange, the response attaching a PDF or other electronic copy

of an existing document. This requirement goes into effect a year from the effective date of the rule.

*Respondents:* 52.

*Frequency:* An average of 75 per year per recipient.

*Estimated Average Burden per*

*Response:* five minutes for the request; 1/2 hour for the response.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 2,625.

#### List of Subjects in 49 CFR Part 26

Administrative practice and procedure, Airports, Civil rights, Government contracts, Grant programs—transportation, Mass transportation, Minority businesses, Reporting and record keeping requirements.

Issued this 11th day of January, 2011, at Washington, DC.

**Ray LaHood,**

*Secretary of Transportation.*

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, the Department amends 49 CFR Part 26 as follows:

#### PART 26—PARTICIPATION BY DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISES IN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 26 is amended to read as follows:

**Authority:** 23 U.S.C. 304 and 324; 42 U.S.C. 2000d, *et seq.*; 49 U.S.C. 47107, 47113, 47123; Sec. 1101(b), Pub. L. 105–178, 112 Stat. 107, 113.

■ 2. In section 26.5, add a definition of "Home state" in alphabetical order to read as follows:

#### § 26.5 What do the terms used in this part mean?

\* \* \* \* \*

"Home state" means the state in which a DBE firm or applicant for DBE certification maintains its principal place of business.

\* \* \* \* \*

■ 3. In § 26.11, add paragraph (a) to read as follows:

#### § 26.11 What records do recipients keep and report?

(a) You must transmit the Uniform Report of DBE Awards or Commitments and Payments, found in Appendix B to this part, at the intervals stated on the form.

\* \* \* \* \*

■ 4. Revise § 26.31 to read as follows:

#### § 26.31 What information must you include in your DBE directory?

(a) In the directory required under § 26.81(g) of this Part, you must list all

firms eligible to participate as DBEs in your program. In the listing for each firm, you must include its address, phone number, and the types of work the firm has been certified to perform as a DBE.

(b) You must list each type of work for which a firm is eligible to be certified by using the most specific NAICS code available to describe each type of work. You must make any changes to your current directory entries necessary to meet the requirement of this paragraph (a) by August 26, 2011.

■ 5. Revise § 26.37 (b) to read as follows:

**§ 26.37 What are a recipient's responsibilities for monitoring the performance of other program participants?**

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) Your DBE program must also include a monitoring and enforcement mechanism to ensure that work committed to DBEs at contract award or subsequently (e.g., as the result of modification to the contract) is actually performed by the DBEs to which the work was committed. This mechanism must include a written certification that you have reviewed contracting records and monitored work sites in your state for this purpose. The monitoring to which this paragraph refers may be conducted in conjunction with monitoring of contract performance for other purposes (e.g., close-out reviews for a contract).

\* \* \* \* \*

■ 6. Add § 26.39 to subpart B to read as follows:

**§ 26.39 Fostering small business participation.**

(a) Your DBE program must include an element to structure contracting requirements to facilitate competition by small business concerns, taking all reasonable steps to eliminate obstacles to their participation, including unnecessary and unjustified bundling of contract requirements that may preclude small business participation in procurements as prime contractors or subcontractors.

(b) This element must be submitted to the appropriate DOT operating administration for approval as a part of your DBE program by February 28, 2012. As part of this program element you may include, but are not limited to, the following strategies:

(1) Establishing a race-neutral small business set-aside for prime contracts under a stated amount (e.g., \$1 million).

(2) In multi-year design-build contracts or other large contracts (e.g., for "megaprojects") requiring bidders on the prime contract to specify elements of the contract or specific subcontracts

that are of a size that small businesses, including DBEs, can reasonably perform.

(3) On prime contracts not having DBE contract goals, requiring the prime contractor to provide subcontracting opportunities of a size that small businesses, including DBEs, can reasonably perform, rather than self-performing all the work involved.

(4) Identifying alternative acquisition strategies and structuring procurements to facilitate the ability of consortia or joint ventures consisting of small businesses, including DBEs, to compete for and perform prime contracts.

(5) To meet the portion of your overall goal you project to meet through race-neutral measures, ensuring that a reasonable number of prime contracts are of a size that small businesses, including DBEs, can reasonably perform.

(c) You must actively implement your program elements to foster small business participation. Doing so is a requirement of good faith implementation of your DBE program.

■ 7. In § 26.45:

■ a. Revise paragraphs (e)(2), (e)(3), (f)(1), and (f)(2);

■ b. Redesignate paragraphs (f)(3) and (f)(4) as (f)(6) and (f)(7), respectively; and

■ c. Add new paragraphs (f)(3), (4), and (5).

The revisions and addition read as follows:

**§ 26.45 How do recipients set overall goals?**

\* \* \* \* \*

(e) \* \* \*

(2) If you are an FTA or FAA recipient, as a percentage of all FT or FAA funds (exclusive of FTA funds to be used for the purchase of transit vehicles) that you will expend in FTA or FAA-assisted contracts in the three forthcoming fiscal years.

(3) In appropriate cases, the FHWA, FTA or FAA Administrator may permit or require you to express your overall goal as a percentage of funds for a particular grant or project or group of grants and/or projects. Like other overall goals, a project goal may be adjusted to reflect changed circumstances, with the concurrence of the appropriate operating administration.

(i) A project goal is an overall goal, and must meet all the substantive and procedural requirements of this section pertaining to overall goals.

(ii) A project goal covers the entire length of the project to which it applies.

(iii) The project goal should include a projection of the DBE participation anticipated to be obtained during each fiscal year covered by the project goal.

(iv) The funds for the project to which the project goal pertains are separated from the base from which your regular overall goal, applicable to contracts not part of the project covered by a project goal, is calculated.

(f)(1)(i) If you set your overall goal on a fiscal year basis, you must submit it to the applicable DOT operating administration by August 1 at three-year intervals, based on a schedule established by the FHWA, FTA, or FAA, as applicable, and posted on that agency's Web site.

(ii) You may adjust your three-year overall goal during the three-year period to which it applies, in order to reflect changed circumstances. You must submit such an adjustment to the concerned operating administration for review and approval.

(iii) The operating administration may direct you to undertake a review of your goal if necessary to ensure that the goal continues to fit your circumstances appropriately.

(iv) While you are required to submit an overall goal to FHWA, FTA, or FAA only every three years, the overall goal and the provisions of Sec. 26.47(c) apply to each year during that three-year period.

(v) You may make, for informational purposes, projections of your expected DBE achievements during each of the three years covered by your overall goal. However, it is the overall goal itself, and not these informational projections, to which the provisions of section 26.47(c) of this part apply.

(2) If you are a recipient and set your overall goal on a project or grant basis as provided in paragraph (e)(3) of this section, you must submit the goal for review at a time determined by the FHWA, FTA or FAA Administrator, as applicable.

(3) You must include with your overall goal submission a description of the methodology you used to establish the goal, including your base figure and the evidence with which it was calculated, and the adjustments you made to the base figure and the evidence you relied on for the adjustments. You should also include a summary listing of the relevant available evidence in your jurisdiction and, where applicable, an explanation of why you did not use that evidence to adjust your base figure. You must also include your projection of the portions of the overall goal you expect to meet through race-neutral and race-conscious measures, respectively (see 26.51(c)).

(4) You are not required to obtain prior operating administration concurrence with your overall goal. However, if the operating

administration's review suggests that your overall goal has not been correctly calculated, or that your method for calculating goals is inadequate, the operating administration may, after consulting with you, adjust your overall goal or require that you do so. The adjusted overall goal is binding on you.

(5) If you need additional time to collect data or take other steps to develop an approach to setting overall goals, you may request the approval of the concerned operating administration for an interim goal and/or goal-setting mechanism. Such a mechanism must:

(i) Reflect the relative availability of DBEs in your local market to the maximum extent feasible given the data available to you; and

(ii) Avoid imposing undue burdens on non-DBEs.

\* \* \* \* \*

■ 8. In § 26.47, add paragraphs (c) and (d) to read as follows:

**§ 26.47 Can recipients be penalized for failing to meet overall goals?**

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) If the awards and commitments shown on your Uniform Report of Awards or Commitments and Payments at the end of any fiscal year are less than the overall goal applicable to that fiscal year, you must do the following in order to be regarded by the Department as implementing your DBE program in good faith:

(1) Analyze in detail the reasons for the difference between the overall goal and your awards and commitments in that fiscal year;

(2) Establish specific steps and milestones to correct the problems you have identified in your analysis and to enable you to meet fully your goal for the new fiscal year;

(3)(i) If you are a state highway agency; one of the 50 largest transit authorities as determined by the FTA; or an Operational Evolution Partnership Plan airport or other airport designated by the FAA, you must submit, within 90 days of the end of the fiscal year, the analysis and corrective actions developed under paragraphs (c)(1) and (2) of this section to the appropriate operating administration for approval. If the operating administration approves the report, you will be regarded as complying with the requirements of this section for the remainder of the fiscal year.

(ii) As a transit authority or airport not meeting the criteria of paragraph (c)(3)(i) of this section, you must retain analysis and corrective actions in your records for three years and make it available to FTA or FAA on request for their review.

(4) FHWA, FTA, or FAA may impose conditions on the recipient as part of its approval of the recipient's analysis and corrective actions including, but not limited to, modifications to your overall goal methodology, changes in your race-conscious/race-neutral split, or the introduction of additional race-neutral or race-conscious measures.

(5) You may be regarded as being in noncompliance with this Part, and therefore subject to the remedies in § 26.103 or § 26.105 of this part and other applicable regulations, for failing to implement your DBE program in good faith if any of the following things occur:

(i) You do not submit your analysis and corrective actions to FHWA, FTA, or FAA in a timely manner as required under paragraph (c)(3) of this section;

(ii) FHWA, FTA, or FAA disapproves your analysis or corrective actions; or

(iii) You do not fully implement the corrective actions to which you have committed or conditions that FHWA, FTA, or FAA has imposed following review of your analysis and corrective actions.

(d) If, as recipient, your Uniform Report of DBE Awards or Commitments and Payments or other information coming to the attention of FTA, FHWA, or FAA, demonstrates that current trends make it unlikely that you will achieve DBE awards and commitments that would be necessary to allow you to meet your overall goal at the end of the fiscal year, FHWA, FTA, or FAA, as applicable, may require you to make further good faith efforts, such as by modifying your race-conscious/race-neutral split or introducing additional race-neutral or race-conscious measures for the remainder of the fiscal year.

■ 9. In § 26.51, revise paragraphs (b)(1) and (f)(1) to read as follows:

**§ 26.51 What means do recipients use to meet overall goals?**

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) \* \* \*

(1) Arranging solicitations, times for the presentation of bids, quantities, specifications, and delivery schedules in ways that facilitate participation by DBEs and other small businesses and by making contracts more accessible to small businesses, by means such as those provided under § 26.39 of this part.

\* \* \* \* \*

(f) \* \* \*

(1) If your approved projection under paragraph (c) of this section estimates that you can meet your entire overall goal for a given year through race-neutral means, you must implement your program without setting contract

goals during that year, unless it becomes necessary in order meet your overall goal.

*Example to paragraph (f)(1):* Your overall goal for Year 1 is 12 percent. You estimate that you can obtain 12 percent or more DBE participation through the use of race-neutral measures, without any use of contract goals. In this case, you do not set any contract goals for the contracts that will be performed in Year 1. However, if part way through Year 1, your DBE awards or commitments are not at a level that would permit you to achieve your overall goal for Year 1, you could begin setting race-conscious DBE contract goals during the remainder of the year as part of your obligation to implement your program in good faith.

\* \* \* \* \*

■ 10. In § 26.53:

■ a. Redesignate paragraph (g) as paragraph (i);

■ b. Redesignate paragraphs (f)(2) and (3) as paragraphs (g) and (h), respectively;

■ c. Revise paragraph (f)(1); and

■ d. Add new paragraphs (f)(2) through (6) to read as follows:

**§ 26.53 What are the good faith efforts procedures recipients follow in situations where there are contract goals?**

\* \* \* \* \*

(f)(1) You must require that a prime contractor not terminate a DBE subcontractor listed in response to paragraph (b)(2) of this section (or an approved substitute DBE firm) without your prior written consent. This includes, but is not limited to, instances in which a prime contractor seeks to perform work originally designated for a DBE subcontractor with its own forces or those of an affiliate, a non-DBE firm, or with another DBE firm.

(2) You may provide such written consent only if you agree, for reasons stated in your concurrence document, that the prime contractor has good cause to terminate the DBE firm.

(3) For purposes of this paragraph, good cause includes the following circumstances:

(i) The listed DBE subcontractor fails or refuses to execute a written contract;

(ii) The listed DBE subcontractor fails or refuses to perform the work of its subcontract in a way consistent with normal industry standards. Provided, however, that good cause does not exist if the failure or refusal of the DBE subcontractor to perform its work on the subcontract results from the bad faith or discriminatory action of the prime contractor;

(iii) The listed DBE subcontractor fails or refuses to meet the prime contractor's



reasonable, nondiscriminatory bond requirements.

(iv) The listed DBE subcontractor becomes bankrupt, insolvent, or exhibits credit unworthiness;

(v) The listed DBE subcontractor is ineligible to work on public works projects because of suspension and debarment proceedings pursuant 2 CFR Parts 180, 215 and 1,200 or applicable state law;

(vi) You have determined that the listed DBE subcontractor is not a responsible contractor;

(vii) The listed DBE subcontractor voluntarily withdraws from the project and provides to you written notice of its withdrawal;

(viii) The listed DBE is ineligible to receive DBE credit for the type of work required;

(ix) A DBE owner dies or becomes disabled with the result that the listed DBE contractor is unable to complete its work on the contract;

(x) Other documented good cause that you determine compels the termination of the DBE subcontractor. Provided, that good cause does not exist if the prime contractor seeks to terminate a DBE it relied upon to obtain the contract so that the prime contractor can self-perform the work for which the DBE contractor was engaged or so that the prime contractor can substitute another DBE or non-DBE contractor after contract award.

(4) Before transmitting to you its request to terminate and/or substitute a DBE subcontractor, the prime contractor must give notice in writing to the DBE subcontractor, with a copy to you, of its intent to request to terminate and/or substitute, and the reason for the request.

(5) The prime contractor must give the DBE five days to respond to the prime contractor's notice and advise you and the contractor of the reasons, if any, why it objects to the proposed termination of its subcontract and why you should not approve the prime contractor's action. If required in a particular case as a matter of public necessity (e.g., safety), you may provide a response period shorter than five days.

(6) In addition to post-award terminations, the provisions of this section apply to preaward deletions of or substitutions for DBE firms put forward by offerors in negotiated procurements.

\* \* \* \* \*

■ 11. In § 26.67, revise paragraphs (a)(2)(i) and (iv), and in paragraphs (b), (c), and (d), remove "\$750,000" and add in its place "\$1.32 million".

The revisions read as follows:

**§ 26.67 What rules determine social and economic disadvantage?**

(a) \* \* \*

(2)(i) You must require each individual owner of a firm applying to participate as a DBE, whose ownership and control are relied upon for DBE certification to certify that he or she has a personal net worth that does not exceed \$1.32 million.

\* \* \* \* \*

(iv) Notwithstanding any provision of Federal or state law, you must not release an individual's personal net worth statement nor any documents pertaining to it to any third party without the written consent of the submitter. Provided, that you must transmit this information to DOT in any certification appeal proceeding under section 26.89 of this part or to any other state to which the individual's firm has applied for certification under § 26.85 of this part.

\* \* \* \* \*

■ 12. Revise § 26.71(n) to read as follows:

**§ 26.71 What rules govern determinations concerning control?**

\* \* \* \* \*

(n) You must grant certification to a firm only for specific types of work in which the socially and economically disadvantaged owners have the ability to control the firm. To become certified in an additional type of work, the firm need demonstrate to you only that its socially and economically disadvantaged owners are able to control the firm with respect to that type of work. You must not require that the firm be recertified or submit a new application for certification, but you must verify the disadvantaged owner's control of the firm in the additional type of work.

(1) The types of work a firm can perform (whether on initial certification or when a new type of work is added) must be described in terms of the most specific available NAICS code for that type of work. If you choose, you may also, in addition to applying the appropriate NAICS code, apply a descriptor from a classification scheme of equivalent detail and specificity. A correct NAICS code is one that describes, as specifically as possible, the principal goods or services which the firm would provide to DOT recipients. Multiple NAICS codes may be assigned where appropriate. Program participants must rely on, and not depart from, the plain meaning of NAICS code descriptions in determining the scope of a firm's certification. If your Directory does not list types of work for any firm

in a manner consistent with this paragraph (a)(1), you must update the Directory entry for that firm to meet the requirements of this paragraph (a)(1) by August 28, 2011.

(2) Firms and recipients must check carefully to make sure that the NAICS codes cited in a certification are kept up-to-date and accurately reflect work which the UCP has determined the firm's owners can control. The firm bears the burden of providing detailed company information the certifying agency needs to make an appropriate NAICS code designation.

(3) If a firm believes that there is not a NAICS code that fully or clearly describes the type(s) of work in which it is seeking to be certified as a DBE, the firm may request that the certifying agency, in its certification documentation, supplement the assigned NAICS code(s) with a clear, specific, and detailed narrative description of the type of work in which the firm is certified. A vague, general, or confusing description is not sufficient for this purpose, and recipients should not rely on such a description in determining whether a firm's participation can be counted toward DBE goals.

(4) A certifier is not precluded from changing a certification classification or description if there is a factual basis in the record. However, certifiers must not make after-the-fact statements about the scope of a certification, not supported by evidence in the record of the certification action.

\* \* \* \* \*

■ 13. Revise § 26.73(b) to read as follows:

**§ 26.73 What are other rules affecting certification?**

\* \* \* \* \*

(b)(1) You must evaluate the eligibility of a firm on the basis of present circumstances. You must not refuse to certify a firm based solely on historical information indicating a lack of ownership or control of the firm by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals at some time in the past, if the firm currently meets the ownership and control standards of this part.

(2) You must not refuse to certify a firm solely on the basis that it is a newly formed firm, has not completed projects or contracts at the time of its application, has not yet realized profits from its activities, or has not demonstrated a potential for success. If the firm meets disadvantaged, size, ownership, and control requirements of

this Part, the firm is eligible for certification.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### § 26.81 [Amended]

■ 14. Amend § 26.81(g) by removing the word “section” and adding in its place the word “part” and by removing the period at the end of the last sentence and adding the words “and shall revise the print version of the Directory at least once a year.”

■ 15. In § 26.83, remove and reserve paragraph (e), revise paragraph (h), and add paragraphs (l) and (m) to read as follows:

#### § 26.83 What procedures do recipients follow in making certification decisions?

\* \* \* \* \*

(h) Once you have certified a DBE, it shall remain certified until and unless you have removed its certification, in whole or in part, through the procedures of section 26.87. You may not require DBEs to reapply for certification or require “recertification” of currently certified firms. However, you may conduct a certification review of a certified DBE firm, including a new on-site review, three years from the date of the firm’s most recent certification, or sooner if appropriate in light of changed circumstances (*e.g.*, of the kind requiring notice under paragraph (i) of this section), a complaint, or other information concerning the firm’s eligibility. If you have grounds to question the firm’s eligibility, you may conduct an on-site review on an unannounced basis, at the firm’s offices and jobsites.

\* \* \* \* \*

(l) As a recipient or UCP, you must advise each applicant within 30 days from your receipt of the application whether the application is complete and suitable for evaluation and, if not, what additional information or action is required.

(m) Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, if an applicant for DBE certification withdraws its application before you have issued a decision on the application, the applicant can resubmit the application at any time. As a recipient or UCP, you may not apply the waiting period provided under § 26.86(c) of this part before allowing the applicant to resubmit its application. However, you may place the reapplication at the “end of the line,” behind other applications that have been made since the firm’s previous application was withdrawn. You may also apply the waiting period provided under § 26.86(c) of this part to a firm that has established a pattern of

frequently withdrawing applications before you make a decision.

#### § 26.84 [Removed]

■ 16. Remove section 26.84.

■ 17. Revise § 26.85 to read as follows

#### § 26.85 Interstate certification.

(a) This section applies with respect to any firm that is currently certified in its home state.

(b) When a firm currently certified in its home state (“State A”) applies to another State (“State B”) for DBE certification, State B may, at its discretion, accept State A’s certification and certify the firm, without further procedures.

(1) To obtain certification in this manner, the firm must provide to State B a copy of its certification notice from State A.

(2) Before certifying the firm, State B must confirm that the firm has a current valid certification from State A. State B can do so by reviewing State A’s electronic directory or obtaining written confirmation from State A.

(c) In any situation in which State B chooses not to accept State A’s certification of a firm as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, as the applicant firm you must provide the information in paragraphs (c)(1) through (4) of this section to State B.

(1) You must provide to State B a complete copy of the application form, all supporting documents, and any other information you have submitted to State A or any other state related to your firm’s certification. This includes affidavits of no change (*see* § 26.83(j)) and any notices of changes (*see* § 26.83(i)) that you have submitted to State A, as well as any correspondence you have had with State A’s UCP or any other recipient concerning your application or status as a DBE firm.

(2) You must also provide to State B any notices or correspondence from states other than State A relating to your status as an applicant or certified DBE in those states. For example, if you have been denied certification or decertified in State C, or subject to a decertification action there, you must inform State B of this fact and provide all documentation concerning this action to State B.

(3) If you have filed a certification appeal with DOT (*see* § 26.89), you must inform State B of the fact and provide your letter of appeal and DOT’s response to State B.

(4) You must submit an affidavit sworn to by the firm’s owners before a person who is authorized by State law to administer oaths or an unsworn declaration executed under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States.

(i) This affidavit must affirm that you have submitted all the information required by 49 CFR 26.85(c) and the information is complete and, in the case of the information required by § 26.85(c)(1), is an identical copy of the information submitted to State A.

(ii) If the on-site report from State A supporting your certification in State A is more than three years old, as of the date of your application to State B, State B may require that your affidavit also affirm that the facts in the on-site report remain true and correct.

(d) As State B, when you receive from an applicant firm all the information required by paragraph (c) of this section, you must take the following actions:

(1) Within seven days contact State A and request a copy of the site visit review report for the firm (*see* § 26.83(c)(1)), any updates to the site visit review, and any evaluation of the firm based on the site visit. As State A, you must transmit this information to State B within seven days of receiving the request. A pattern by State B of not making such requests in a timely manner or by “State A” or any other State of not complying with such requests in a timely manner is noncompliance with this Part.

(2) Determine whether there is good cause to believe that State A’s certification of the firm is erroneous or should not apply in your State. Reasons for making such a determination may include the following:

(i) Evidence that State A’s certification was obtained by fraud;

(ii) New information, not available to State A at the time of its certification, showing that the firm does not meet all eligibility criteria;

(iii) State A’s certification was factually erroneous or was inconsistent with the requirements of this part;

(iv) The State law of State B requires a result different from that of the State law of State A.

(v) The information provided by the applicant firm did not meet the requirements of paragraph (c) of this section.

(3) If, as State B, unless you have determined that there is good cause to believe that State A’s certification is erroneous or should not apply in your State, you must, no later than 60 days from the date on which you received from the applicant firm all the information required by paragraph (c) of this section, send to the applicant firm a notice that it is certified and place the firm on your directory of certified firms.

(4) If, as State B, you have determined that there is good cause to believe that State A’s certification is erroneous or should not apply in your State, you

must, no later than 60 days from the date on which you received from the applicant firm all the information required by paragraph (c) of this section, send to the applicant firm a notice stating the reasons for your determination.

(i) This notice must state with particularity the specific reasons why State B believes that the firm does not meet the requirements of this Part for DBE eligibility and must offer the firm an opportunity to respond to State B with respect to these reasons.

(ii) The firm may elect to respond in writing, to request an in-person meeting with State B's decision maker to discuss State B's objections to the firm's eligibility, or both. If the firm requests a meeting, as State B you must schedule the meeting to take place within 30 days of receiving the firm's request.

(iii) The firm bears the burden of demonstrating, by a preponderance of evidence, that it meets the requirements of this Part with respect to the particularized issues raised by State B's notice. The firm is not otherwise responsible for further demonstrating its eligibility to State B.

(iv) The decision maker for State B must be an individual who is thoroughly familiar with the provisions of this Part concerning certification.

(v) State B must issue a written decision within 30 days of the receipt of the written response from the firm or the meeting with the decision maker, whichever is later.

(vi) The firm's application for certification is stayed pending the outcome of this process.

(vii) A decision under this paragraph (d)(4) may be appealed to the

Departmental Office of Civil Rights under s§ 26.89 of this part.

(e) As State B, if you have not received from State A a copy of the site visit review report by a date 14 days after you have made a timely request for it, you may hold action required by paragraphs (d)(2) through (4) of this section in abeyance pending receipt of the site visit review report. In this event, you must, no later than 30 days from the date on which you received from an applicant firm all the information required by paragraph (c) of this section, notify the firm in writing of the delay in the process and the reason for it.

(f)(1) As a UCP, when you deny a firm's application, reject the application of a firm certified in State A or any other State in which the firm is certified, through the procedures of paragraph (d)(4) of this section, or decertify a firm, in whole or in part, you must make an entry in the Department of Transportation Office of Civil Rights' (DOCR's) Ineligibility Determination Online Database. You must enter the following information:

- (i) The name of the firm;
- (ii) The name(s) of the firm's owner(s);
- (iii) The type and date of the action;
- (iv) The reason for the action.

(2) As a UCP, you must check the DOCR Web site at least once every month to determine whether any firm that is applying to you for certification or that you have already certified is on the list.

(3) For any such firm that is on the list, you must promptly request a copy of the listed decision from the UCP that made it. As the UCP receiving such a request, you must provide a copy of the decision to the requesting UCP within 7 days of receiving the request. As the

UCP receiving the decision, you must then consider the information in the decision in determining what, if any, action to take with respect to the certified DBE firm or applicant.

(g) You must implement the requirements of this section beginning January 1, 2012.

**§ 26.87 [Amended]**

■ 18. In § 26.87, remove and reserve paragraph (h).

**§ 26.107 [Amended]**

■ 19. In § 26.107, in paragraphs (a) and (b), remove "49 CFR part 29" and add in its place, "2 CFR parts 180 and 1200".

■ 20. In § 26.109, revise paragraph (a)(2) to read as follows:

**§ 26.109 What are the rules governing information, confidentiality, cooperation, and intimidation or retaliation?**

(a) \* \* \*

(2) Notwithstanding any provision of Federal or state law, you must not release any information that may reasonably be construed as confidential business information to any third party without the written consent of the firm that submitted the information. This includes applications for DBE certification and supporting information. However, you must transmit this information to DOT in any certification appeal proceeding under § 26.89 of this part or to any other state to which the individual's firm has applied for certification under § 26.85 of this part.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2011-1531 Filed 1-27-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-9X-P