

1. Description of Study Area and Scope

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), in cooperation with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and Utah Transit Authority (UTA) is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a proposed action approximately 66 miles in length to address capacity, operational, infrastructure deficiencies along I-15 from Santaquin to the 10600 South Interchange (southern point of previous I-15 reconstruction). The proposed action will also examine transit alternatives that address the purpose and need for the corridor including, but not limited to, commuter rail from Payson to the Salt Lake City Intermodal Center, light rail from 1000 South in Sandy to Orem, and bus rapid transit.

II. Purpose and Need

Growth within Utah County over the last ten years has been significant. Population in Utah and Salt Lake counties is expected to grow 84 and 63 percent respectively by the year 2030, at an annual growth rate of approximately 2.0 percent. I-15 is the only continuous north-south route in Utah County, and the primary north-south facility in the State. Sections of I-15 are currently demonstrating unacceptable levels of service in the peak hours resulting in significant driver delay and frustration.

Two recent planning studies have identified possible transit and highway transportation solutions for the Utah County and southern Salt Lake County. These two studies are the Inter-Regional Corridor Alternatives Analysis (January 2002) and the Utah County I-15 Corridor Management Plan (August 2002). This EIS will build upon these previous studies and will also analyze the environmental impacts for various alternatives.

III. Alternatives

The proposed project intends to consider no-build, transportation system management, highway only, transit only, and multimodal build alternatives to address the transportation need. Build alternatives for I-15 will consider widening the facility, improvements to or new interchanges, and correction of existing deficiencies.

Alternatives 1: No-Action. This alternative consists of highway and transit systems existing as of year 2004, plus improvements programmed in the approved long range transportation plan.

Alternative 2: Transportation Systems Management. This alternative consists of low cost, reasonable and cost-

effective highway and transit system improvements within the I-15 Corridor that address the purpose and need.

Alternative 3: Highway-Only Improvements: Based on previous studies, this alternative consists of reconstructing existing interchanges; constructing 3-5 new interchanges; possibly including collector-distributor lanes from University Parkway to 920 South Provo; and widening I-15 from 6 to 8 general purpose lanes from the Salt Lake County line to the US-6 interchange in Spanish Fork.

Alternative 4: Transit-Only Improvements. This alternative consists of transit improvements paralleling I-15, including examining commuter rail, light rail, bus rapid transit, and managed lanes.

Alternative 5: Multimodal Improvements: This alternative consists of Alternative 3 (with possible modifications) plus transit improvements, including examining commuter rail, light rail, bus rapid transit, and managed lanes. This alternative could become multiple alternatives depending on alignment and mode.

IV. Probable Effects

Environmental issues to be examined in the Alternatives Analysis and in the EIS include: potential changes to the physical environment (natural resources, air quality, noise, water quality, geology, visual); changes in the social environment (land use, development, business and neighborhood disruptions); changes in traffic and pedestrian circulation; changes in transit service and patronage; associated changes in traffic congestion; and impacts on parklands and historic sites. Impacts will be identified both for the construction period and for the long-term operation of the alternatives. The proposed evaluation criteria include transportation, social, economic, and financial measures, as required by current federal (NEPA) environmental laws and current Council on Environmental Quality; FHWA and FTA guidelines.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action will be addressed and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS should be directed to UDOT as noted above.

V. FHWA Procedures

The EIS for the I-15 Corridor Utah and Salt Lake counties will be prepared simultaneously with conceptual engineering. The EIS/conceptual

engineering process will address the potential use of federal funds for the proposed action, as well as assess the social, economic and environmental impacts of the alternatives.

After publication the Draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment, and public hearings will be held. Based on the Draft EIS comments received, UDOT will select a locally preferred alternative for further assessment in the Final EIS.

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

Issued on: August 27, 2004.

Jeffrey Berna,

Environmental Specialist, Salt Lake City, Utah

[FR Doc. 04-20018 Filed 9-1-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

Proposed Agency Information Collection Activities; Comment Request

AGENCY: Federal Railroad Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and its implementing regulations, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) hereby announces that it is seeking renewal of the following currently approved information collection activities. Before submitting these information collection requirements for clearance by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), FRA is soliciting public comment on specific aspects of the activities identified below.

DATES: Comments must be received no later than November 1, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments on any or all of the following proposed activities by mail to either: Mr. Robert Brogan, Office of Safety, Planning and Evaluation Division, RRS-21, Federal Railroad Administration, 1120 Vermont Ave., NW., Mail Stop 17, Washington, DC 20590, or Ms. Debra Steward, Office of Information Technology and Productivity Improvement, RAD-20, Federal Railroad Administration, 1120 Vermont Ave., NW., Mail Stop 35, Washington, DC 20590. Commenters requesting FRA to acknowledge receipt of their respective comments must

include a self-addressed stamped postcard stating, "Comments on OMB control number 2130-NEW." Alternatively, comments may be transmitted via facsimile to (202) 493-6230 or (202) 493-6170, or e-mail to Mr. Brogan at robert.brogan@fra.dot.gov, or to Ms. Steward at debra.steward@fra.dot.gov. Please refer to the assigned OMB control number in any correspondence submitted. FRA will summarize comments received in response to this notice in a subsequent notice and include them in its information collection submission to OMB for approval.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Robert Brogan, Office of Planning and Evaluation Division, RRS-21, Federal Railroad Administration, 1120 Vermont Ave., NW., Mail Stop 17, Washington, DC 20590 (telephone: (202) 493-6292) or Debra Steward, Office of Information Technology and Productivity Improvement, RAD-20, Federal Railroad Administration, 1120 Vermont Ave., NW., Mail Stop 35, Washington, DC 20590 (telephone: (202) 493-6139). (These telephone numbers are not toll-free.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), Pub. L. No. 104-13, § 2, 109 Stat. 163 (1995) (codified as revised at 44 U.S.C. §§ 3501-3520), and its implementing regulations, 5 CFR Part 1320, require Federal agencies to provide 60-days notice to the public for comment on information collection activities before seeking approval for reinstatement or renewal by OMB. 44 U.S.C. § 3506(c)(2)(A); 5 CFR §§ 1320.8(d)(1), 1320.10(e)(1), 1320.12(a). Specifically, FRA invites interested respondents to comment on the following summary of proposed information collection activities regarding (i) Whether the information collection activities are necessary for FRA to properly execute its functions, including whether the activities will have practical utility; (ii) the accuracy of

FRA's estimates of the burden of the information collection activities, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used to determine the estimates; (iii) ways for FRA to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information being collected; and (iv) ways for FRA to minimize the burden of information collection activities on the public by automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology (e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses). See 44 U.S.C. § 3506(c)(2)(A)(i)-(iv); 5 CFR § 1320.8(d)(1)(i)-(iv). FRA believes that soliciting public comment will promote its efforts to reduce the administrative and paperwork burdens associated with the collection of information mandated by Federal regulations. In summary, FRA reasons that comments received will advance three objectives: (i) Reduce reporting burdens; (ii) ensure that it organizes information collection requirements in a "user friendly" format to improve the use of such information; and (iii) accurately assess the resources expended to retrieve and produce information requested. See 44 U.S.C. § 3501.

Below is a brief summary of proposed new information collection activities that FRA will submit for clearance by OMB as required under the PRA:

Title: Safety Appliance Concern Recommendation Report; Guidance Checklist Forms.

OMB Control Number: 2130-NEW.

Abstract: In an ongoing effort to conduct more thorough and more effective inspections of railroad freight equipment and to further enhance safe rail operations, FRA has developed a safety concern recommendation report form, and a group of guidance checklist forms that will facilitate railroad, rail car owner, and rail equipment manufacturer compliance with agency Railroad Safety Appliance Standards regulations. In lieu of completing an

official inspection report (Form FRA F 6180.96), which takes subject railroad equipment out of service and disrupts rail operations, proposed new Form FRA F 6180.4a will enable Federal and State safety inspectors to report to agency headquarters systemic or other safety concerns. FRA headquarters safety specialists can then contact railroads, car owners, and equipment manufacturers to address the reported issue(s) and institute necessary corrective action(s) in a timely fashion without unnecessarily having to take affected rail equipment out of service, unless deemed defective. Proposed forms FRA F 6180.4(b)-(m) will be used in conjunction with the Special Inspection of Safety Appliance Equipment form (Form FRA F 6180.4) to assist Federal Motive, Power, and Equipment (MP&E) field inspectors in ensuring that critical sections of 49 CFR Part 231 (Railroad Safety Appliance Standards), pertaining to various types of freight equipment, are complied with through use of a check-off list. By simplifying their demanding work, check-off lists for 12 essential sections of Part 231 will ensure that FRA MP&E field personnel completely and thoroughly inspect each type of freight car for compliance with its corresponding section in Part 231. The proposed Guidance Checklist forms may later be used by state field inspectors as well. FRA believes that the proposed collection of information will result in improved construction of newly designed freight cars and improved field inspections of all freight cars currently in use. This, in turn, will serve to reduce the number of accidents/incidents and corresponding injuries and fatalities that occur every year due to unsafe or defective equipment that was not promptly repaired/replaced.

Form Number(s): FRA F 6180.4(a)-(m).

Affected Public: Businesses.

Reporting Burden:

Form number	Respondent universe	Total annual responses (forms)	Average time per response (minutes)	Total annual burden hours	Total annual burden cost
FRA F 6180.4a—MP&E Safety Concern and Recommendation Report.	100 Fed'l & State Inspectors	50	60	50	\$2,450
FRA F 6180.4b—Check List Sec. 231.1.	100 Fed'l & State Inspectors	20	60	20	980
FRA F 100 6180.4c—Check List Sec. 231.2.	100 Fed'l & State Inspectors	20	60	20	980
FRA F 6180.4d—Check List Sec. 231.3.	100 Fed'l & State Inspectors	10	60	10	490
FRA F 6180.4e—Check List Sec. 231.4.	100 Fed'l & State Inspectors	5	60	5	245
FRA F 6180.4f—Check List Sec. 231.5.	100 Fed'l & State Inspectors	5	60	5	245

Form number	Respondent universe	Total annual responses (forms)	Average time per response (minutes)	Total annual burden hours	Total annual burden cost
FRA F 6180.4g—Check List Sec. 231.6.	100 Fed'l & State Inspectors	30	60	30	1,470
FRA F 6180.4h—Check List 231.7 ...	100 Fed'l & State Inspectors	5	60	5	245
FRA F 6180.4i—Check List Sec. 231.8.	100 Fed'l & State Inspectors	5	60	5	245
FRA F 6180.4j—Check List Sec. 231.9.	100 Fed'l & State Inspectors	5	60	5	245
FRA F 6180.4k—Check List Sec. 231.21.	100 Fed'l & State Inspectors	50	60	50	2,450
FRA F 6180.4l—Check List Sec. 231.27.	100 Fed'l & State Inspectors	25	60	25	1,225
FRA F 6180.4m—Check List Sec. 231.28.	100 Fed'l & State Inspectors	10	60	10	490

Respondent Universe: Federal and State Safety Inspectors.

Frequency of Submission: On occasion.

Total Responses: 240 Forms.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 240 hours.

Status: Regular Review.

Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3507(a) and 5 CFR §§ 1320.5(b), 1320.8(b)(3)(vi), FRA informs all interested parties that it may not conduct or sponsor, and a respondent is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Authority: 44 U.S.C. §§ 3501–3520.

Issued in Washington, DC on August 27, 2004.

Kathy A. Weiner,

Director, Office of Information Technology and Support Systems, Federal Railroad Administration.

[FR Doc. 04–20069 Filed 9–1–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

Red River Valley & Western Railroad Company, and Red River Grain

[Waiver Petition Docket Number FRA–2004–17993]

The Red River Valley & Western Railroad Company (RRVW) and Red River Grain (RRG) petitioners propose to operate a diesel electric locomotive, number RRVW 1213, with laminated safety glass glazing, which is non-compliant with current Federal Safety Regulations. The locomotive, Model SW1200, built by General Motors' Electro Motive Division (EMD) at LaGrange, Illinois in 1959, is proposed to operate in switching and industrial operations. The above mentioned locomotive is owned by RRG of Breckenridge, Minnesota and is also named as the co-petitioner for this waiver. RRVW operates 456 miles of mainline track primarily in North Dakota, with a switching/interchange yard located in Breckenridge, Minnesota. The towns that RRVW operates in and through are sparsely populated rural areas that are primarily utilized for agricultural or ranching purposes. Presently, the maximum track speed is 25 MPH.

The RRVW began operations in 1987 by acquiring branch lines from the Burlington Northern Railroad Company. Since that time, petitioners have reported that there have been no acts of vandalism inflicted on any of their locomotives. This includes rock throwing and gunfire directed at locomotive while moving or stationary.

The petitioners request relief from the requirements of Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 223.11 *Requirement for existing locomotives* because the locomotive operates in rural areas and is primarily utilized in switching or industrial service. Both petitioners report that their records indicate that no acts of vandalism have occurred to any of their locomotives. The petitioners also report that replacement of the

glazing at this time would create an unnecessary financial burden.

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

All communications concerning these proceedings should identify the appropriate docket number (e.g., Waiver Petition Docket Number FRA–2004–17993) and must be submitted to the Docket Clerk, DOT Docket Management Facility, Room PL–401 (Plaza Level), 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Communications received within 30 days of the date of this notice will be considered by FRA before final action is taken. Comments received after that date will be considered as far as practicable. All written communications concerning these proceedings are available for examination during regular business hours (9 a.m.–5 p.m.) at the above facility. All documents in the public docket are also available for inspection and copying on the Internet at the docket facility's site at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477–78). The statement may also be found at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

Petition for Waiver of Compliance

In accordance with Part 211 of Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), notice is hereby given that the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) received a request for a waiver of compliance with certain requirements of its safety regulations. The individual petition is described below, including the party seeking relief, the regulatory provisions involved, the nature of the relief being requested, and the petitioner's arguments in favor of relief.