dampen the progress of any car that is derailed, so that the car will stop moving before the face of the coupler reaches the aisle. The blue light, derail and red light will all be remotely and automatically controlled from a tower that is within 1,500 feet of the aisle and will have a continuous uninterrupted view of the yard. There will also be a blue light signal and derail across the aisle, 80 feet from the other blue light and derail, in essence providing dual protection for the workmen.

The facility will load and unload ships and intermodal unit trains. In a typical operation, a loaded train will enter the yard from the north, pulling enough cars to fill the first track. The speed limit in the yard will be 5 mph. The locomotive will pull these cars onto the first track, where a cut will be made just before the aisle, and those cars to be unloaded on the north side of the aisle will be set out. The locomotive will then pull the rest of the cars onto the track south of the aisle where they will be set out. The locomotive will then exit the first track, proceed north on the run-around track to the north of the yard and pick-up another cut of cars to fill the second track. This will continue until the incoming train is spotted or all 10 tracks are filled. Excess cars can be spotted in a storage yard northeast of and adjacent to the main yard. During the process, once each cut of cars is set out on the appropriate track, the blue lights and derails will be set.

At that point, from one to four gantry type cranes may be used to unload the railroad cars on any given spur. Tractors will move the trailers or containers either to a storage area, or directly to ships that are berthed at the facility. These tractors will use the aisle as the means of access to and from the yard with both chassis and containers. A similar process will be followed when loading unit trains from a ship or the container storage yard.

APL requests waiver of the 150 foot requirement for the blue lights and derail devices to be used in the center aisle in the yard. Each group of workmen will be protected by blue light signals 80 feet apart across the aisle. Each group of workmen will also be protected by two derail devices. The first will be within 5 feet of the coupling face, and the other will be 80 feet from the first derail device, across the aisle. Workmen will not begin working to load or unload the cars on any given spur until the cars have come to a complete stop and are protected as set out in this waiver request. They will be protected by two blue light signals and by two derail devices.

APL states that it ''is working with the Port in the process of designing the yard. One important facet of this design is that workmen be able to work in close proximity to the aisle to increase efficiency. As indicated in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, when certain criteria are present, a railroad may safely use different approaches to afford blue signal protection.'' APL states they will meet those criteria. ''First, slow speeds are involved since there is a 5 mph speed limit in the yard. Next, control over the movement of the equipment will be placed in the hands of individuals directly responsible for the people who need to be protected. In the Final Rule, FRA expressed its goal of assuring workers' safety.'' APL states that ''the combination of very low speed, a movement dampening surface, and derails in close proximity to cars that are standing still will limit travel to not more than 5 feet after derailment which is well within FRA's goal to: assure that rolling equipment will not travel more than 50 feet after derailment.''

APL states that ''the waiver sought by APL will allow construction of a modern and efficient rail yard as part of an intermodal facility at the Port of Los Angeles. By operating with a reduced distance for blue lights and derail devices, APL will be able to fit the yard to the property available. This project will substantially increase the amount of rail business at the Port and in the region. Shorter train movements in the yard will also reduce air emissions in the Port, thereby reducing harm to the environment.''

Issued in Washington, DC on February 23, 1995.

Phil Olekszyk,

Acting Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Compliance and Program Implementation.

[FR Doc. 95–5689 Filed 3–7–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–6–P

Federal Transit Administration

Environmental Impact Statement on the North-South Rail Link, Boston, Cambridge and Somerville, MA

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

SUMMARY: The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) intend to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) on the proposed rail link connecting North and South Stations in Boston, Massachusetts. The FTA and the MBTA will prepare the EIS so that it also satisfies the requirements of the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA).

This effort will be performed in cooperation with the Massachusetts Highway Department and the Executive Office of Transportation and Construction.

The EIS/EIR will evaluate the following alternatives: A Build alternative consisting of an underground rail link tunnel (with an option of two or four tracks) connecting North and South Stations along the Central Artery alignment, a No-Build alternative, and a Transportation System Management alternative which will be identified during the scoping process. Although the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has elected to pursue the North-South Rail Link corridor within the Central Artery alignment, the FTA is interested in receiving comments regarding whether a rail link along the Congress Street alignment should be included in the Major Investment Study (MIS). Scoping will be accomplished through correspondence with interested persons, organizations, and Federal, State and local agencies, and through public meetings.

DATES: *Comment Due Date:* Written comments on the scope of alternatives and impacts to be considered should be sent to the MBTA by April 24, 1995. See **ADDRESSES** below. *Scoping Meeting:* A joint FTA and MEPA public scoping meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 21, 1995 at 2:00 p.m. at the State Transportation Building. See **ADDRESSES** below.

ADDRESSES: *Written comments* on the project scope should be sent to Mr. Andrew D. Brennan, Manager of Environmental Affairs, MBTA, 10 Park Plaza, Room 6720, Boston, MA 02116. A *Scoping Meeting* will be held at the following location: State Transportation Building, 10 Park Plaza, Boston, MA 02116.

See **DATES** above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Mary Beth Mello, Deputy Regional Administrator, Federal Transit Administration, Region 1, (617) 494–2055.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Scoping

The FTA and MBTA invite written comments for a period of 45 days after publication of this notice (See **DATES** and **ADDRESSES** above.) During scoping,

comments should focus on identifying specific social, economic, or environmental impacts to be evaluated, and suggesting alternatives that are less costly or less environmentally damaging which achieve similar objectives. Comments should focus on the issues and alternatives for analysis, and not on a preference for a particular alternative. Individual preference for a particular alternative should be communicated during the comment period for the Draft EIS.

If you wish to be placed on the mailing list to receive further information as the project continues, contact Mr. Andrew Brennan at the MBTA (see **ADDRESSES** above).

II. Description of Study Area and Project Need

The proposed project consists of an approximately 3 mile rail tunnel linking North and South Stations in Boston, Massachusetts. The northern tunnel portals will be located to the north of the Gilmore Bridge and west of the I–93 highway viaduct in Somerville, Massachusetts. There will be two southern tunnel portals: one on the southern side of the Massachusetts Turnpike between Harrison and Shawmut Avenues, and the other in the vicinity of the railroad yard south of the West Fourth Street Bridge in South Boston. Three underground passenger stations are proposed: (1) At the existing South Station, (2) near the MBTA Blue Line adjacent to the Aquarium Station, and (3) between Haymarket and North Stations. The project will also define options for creating regional MBTA rail service by combining the two currently separate north and south side commuter rail networks.

The construction of the rail link tunnel will close the gap in intercity rail service along the Atlantic seaboard, and will create a unified rail system for metropolitan Boston by combining the two currently separate north and south side commuter rail networks. This will reduce rapid transit system congestion in downtown Boston, increase operational capacity at South Station, and improve regional air quality by diverting automobile trips to the rail system.

III. Alternatives

The alternatives proposed for evaluation include: (1) No-action, which involves no change to existing rail facilities at North and South Stations,

(2) construction of a rail link tunnel connecting North and South Stations along the Central Artery alignment. A two-track and a four-track tunnel option will be considered, and

(3) a transportation system management alternative that will be identified during the scoping process.

Although the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has elected to pursue the North-South Rail Link corridor within the Central Artery alignment, the FTA is interested in receiving comments regarding whether a rail link along the Congress Street alignment should be included in the MIS.

IV. Probable Effects

FTA and the MBTA will evaluate all significant environmental, social, and economic impacts of the alternatives analyzed in the EIS. Impacts include changes in the natural environment (air and water quality, rare and endangered species), changes in the social environment (land use and neighborhoods, noise and vibration, aesthetics, park lands, historic/archeological resources), disposal of excavated material, public safety and changes in rail service and patronage. An operational analysis of combined north and south side commuter rail networks will be performed and project capital and operating costs and revenues will be estimated. The impacts will be evaluated both for the construction period and for the long term period of operation, and financial information in support of the MIS will be provided. Measures to mitigate significant adverse impacts will also be addressed.

Issued on: March 2, 1995.

Richard H. Doyle,

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95–5587 Filed 3–7–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–57–P

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 92–50; Notice 4]

Autokraft Ltd.; Grant of Application for Renewal of Temporary Exemption From Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 208

Autokraft Limited of Weybridge, Surrey, England, applied for a renewal of NHTSA Exemption No. 92–6, exempting its AC MkIV until January 1, 1995, from compliance with paragraph S4.1.4 of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*. The basis of the application was that compliance would cause substantial economic hardship to a manufacturer that has tried to comply with the standard in good faith.

Notice of receipt of the application was published on December 19, 1994, and an opportunity afforded for comment (59 FR 65428).

Autokraft was granted NHTSA Exemption No. 92–6 on December 21, 1992 (57 FR 60563), and its exemption from S4.1.4 of Standard No. 208 was scheduled to expire on January 1, 1995. Because the application for renewal of the exemption was filed ''not later than 60 days before the termination date'' (in this instance, October 27, 1994), the termination date has been stayed until the Administrator has acted upon the application (49 CFR 555.8(e)).

The applicant sought a further two-year exemption for its AC Mk IV passenger car, of which it has produced 15 in the year preceding the filing of its application. Although the company had projected sales of 150 units in the United States in the years 1992–94, in fact, there were only seven sales. According to its application, Autokraft ''has continued the process of researching and developing the installation of a driver and passenger side airbag system'' but ''we have been unable to achieve the fitting of a suitable system mainly due to the chassis design being based upon a classic 1960's design and not easily adaptable to suit air bag installation.'' The delay is also due to ''the project having insufficient funds generated by sales and available for completing the development.''

Autokraft concluded that the adaptation of an existing automatic restraint system is the only viable alternative. Its continuation of compliance efforts has given it ''significant knowledge into the areas of vehicle modification, computer simulation, design rough road testing and low, medium and high speed crash testing.'' Complicating its efforts is the need to use a different engine and transmission after October 1, 1995, and the possible effect that this will have upon compliance. It estimated the cost to achieve conformance would be $550,000, achievable by spreading these costs during the exemption period. Autokraft reported losses totalling 3,308,243 Pounds Sterling (approximately $5,624,000 at a rate of $1.70/1) for the years 1992–93, and projected a further loss for 1994.

The company argued that an exemption would be in the public interest and consistent with the objectives of motor vehicle safety because it meets all applicable EEC standards, and all U.S. Federal motor vehicle safety standards with the exception of the automatic restraint requirements of Standard No. 208 (its 3-point driver and passenger restraints meet the previous requirements). The production of the car makes available to