<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>California:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hawaii:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu (EPR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 9–12, 1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region 10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon: Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washington:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle (EPR Week of May 8–12, 1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: "X" indicates month of certification review; dates are specified where they are scheduled. Enhanced Planning Reviews (EPR) generally are scheduled for approximately 3-4 days during a given week.*

**Guidance and Responsibility**

The FHWA and the FTA published guidance on the certification of planning processes (59 FR 42873). The guidance indicated that the primary responsibility for the certification process rested with the respective regional offices of the FHWA and the FTA. The preparatory work and analysis would be conducted by the appropriate division office of the FHWA or regional office of FTA, as a prelude to a site visit by representatives of both agencies to the metropolitan planning area to be certified. During the site visit, the FHWA and FTA representatives would, in addition to meeting with representatives of the MPO, State DOTs, and transit agencies serving the metropolitan planning area, provide an opportunity to meet with citizens and elected local officials of the principal local governments in the area. The purpose of these meetings is to afford the officials and citizens an opportunity to provide input to the certification decision in terms of the performance of the planning process.

As indicated above, the MPO and/or State DOT or transit operator may make arrangements for these meetings through their normal procedures. Other alternatives are acceptable based on arrangements between the Federal agencies and the appropriate transportation planning agencies.

Officials and citizens wishing to obtain information regarding the process of providing input should contact the MPO for the metropolitan planning areas identified above. Alternatively, the Transportation Planner or Planning and Research Engineer for the appropriate Division office of the FHWA also can provide this information. Each FHWA Division office is located in or near the capital of each State.


**Gordon J. Linton,** Administrator, Federal Transit Administration.

**Rodney E. Slater,** Administrator, Federal Highway Administration.

**Federal Transit Administration**

**Environmental Impact Statement:** Peninsula Commute Service San Francisco Downtown Extension (PCS-DTX) Project in the San Francisco Bay Area, California

**AGENCY:** Federal Transit Administration, DOT.

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

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), in cooperation with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB), is resuming preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for the PCS-DTX in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The PCJPB will ensure that the EIS also satisfies the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The NEPA Lead Agency will be FTA. The CEQA Lead Agency will be the PCJPB.

The Peninsula Commute Service, commonly referred to as CalTrain, is the commuter rail system that serves the San Francisco Peninsula between Gilroy and the existing terminal station in San Francisco located at Fourth and Townsend Streets. The present location of the terminal is not considered desirable from a transportation, land use, or public policy perspective. The proposed project would extend CalTrain to a new station closer to downtown San Francisco.

The project was determined by the Bay Area Partnership, a body of transportation officials representing different modes, regulatory agencies and federal agencies, to belong in the category of projects "requiring a Major Investment Study (MIS) but may be satisfied by prior studies". The consultation group convened to discuss MIS requirements for this project agreed that past corridor studies such as PENTAP, SCR 74, BART/SFO AA/DEIS, and the MTC/JPBCalTrain Downtown Extension/System Upgrades Study satisfy MIS requirements and that the project could advance into preliminary engineering and environmental documentation.

**DATES:** Written comments on the alternatives and impacts to be considered must be postmarked no later than June 15, 1995, and send to PCJPB at the address below. Two public informational meetings will be held June 21, 1995 at 10 AM-noon and 5:30 PM-7:30 PM in Auditorium B, Golden Gate University, 536 Mission Street, San Francisco 94105. These meetings will mark the resumption of environmental studies and preparation of the EIS/EIR (see SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION below).

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be sent to Ms. Marie Pang, Environmental Manager, PCS-DTX Project, Peninsula Corridor JPB, P.O. Box 3006, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306. Phone: (415) 508-6338.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Robert Hom, Director, Program Development, FTA Region IX, 201 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94105. Phone: (415) 744-3116.
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Scoping

A Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS was previously published in the Federal Register on January 18, 1989. The Scoping Process began with two public scoping meetings on February 15, 1989. An Administrative Draft EIS was prepared in 1991 but was not circulated due to lack of local funding commitments for the project.

The project was held in abeyance until March, 1993, when the PCJPB conducted four public meetings to solicit public input on key project issues, including which alternatives deserved further consideration. As a result, the PCJPB, jointly with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), conducted a study to develop fundable extension alternatives and system upgrades that could be recommended by the PCJPB for inclusion in the MTC’s financially constrained Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The study evaluated nine alternatives and the results were reviewed in public meetings. In March, 1994, the PCJPB designated Alternative 88 (extension of CalTrain to an underground terminal at Beale and Market Streets) of that study as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for inclusion in the RTP. This alternative was subsequently included in the 1994 RTP adopted by MTC after extensive public review. The PCJPB is now resuming environmental studies for the preparation of a Draft EIS/EIR for public review and comment.

The public informational meetings will announce resumption of environmental studies. The environmental process will be outlined, and the public will be invited to become involved in this process through the Public Participation/Consensus Building Program that will be implemented for this project. The public will be invited to comment on all aspects of the project, including alignments, station design, and the environmental, social and economic impacts to be analyzed. The public will also be notified of future informational meetings and workshops as the studies progress.

II. Description of Study Area

The Peninsula Commute Service traverses three counties (San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara) from San Francisco to Gilroy for a distance of approximately 77 miles. However, most of the proposed project is located in the City of San Francisco, in an area generally bounded by Market Street, the Embarcadero, China Basin Channel, Sixteenth Street, Seventh Street, Bryant Street and Second Street. The primary east-west corridors are along Brannan, Townsend and King Streets; primary north-south corridors are along Beale Street and Colin P. Kelly/Essex Streets (to the Transbay Terminal). The proposed station location is at Beale and Market Streets; however, the existing Transbay Transit Terminal location will also be evaluated in the event the LPA location proves feasible.

III. Alternatives

Three alternatives with sub-options emerged from the evaluation and public participation processes conducted previously. These alternatives will be evaluated in the DEIS/DEIR as follows:

- Alternative 1—No Build. The San Francisco station would remain at 4th and Townsend.
- Alternative 2 (The Proposed Project [LPA])—CalTrain would be extended to a station at Beale and Market Streets with the following routing and fuel options:
  - Option A—CalTrain would be routed on the surface along Townsend Street to 4th Street, underground via cut and cover under public streets from 4th Street to Market and Beale Streets. King and Brannan Streets, would be considered should Townsend Street prove infeasible. Full system electrification is included in this option.
  - Option B—Same as Option A, except existing locomotives with diesel power would be used or would be converted to liquefied natural gas.
  - Option C—Same as Option A, except that a direct mined or bored tunnel alignment would be used from approximately 3rd Street to approximately Harrison and Beale Streets under private properties in the South Beach Area.
- Alternative 3—CalTrain would be extended to a station at the existing Transbay Transit Terminal location. The PCS would be routed on the surface along Townsend Street, underground via cut and cover and/or mined tunnel to Folsom/Essex Streets and from there to a new or rehabilitated Transbay Transit Terminal. King or Brannan Streets would be considered should Townsend prove infeasible. Full system electrification is included in this alternative.

IV. Probable Effects

Impacts proposed for analysis include changes in the physical environment (air quality, noise, water quality, geology, visual); changes in the social environment (land use, business disruptions, and neighborhoods); changes in traffic and pedestrian circulation; impacts on parklands and historic sites; changes in transit service and patronage; associated changes in highway congestion; capital, operating and maintenance costs; and financial implications. Impacts will be identified both for the construction period and for the long term operation of the alternatives. The proposed evaluation criteria include transportation, environmental, social, economic and financial measures as required by current Federal (NEPA) and State (CEQA) environmental laws and current Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and FTA guidelines. Mitigating measures will be explored for adverse impacts that are identified.

Issued on: May 12, 1995.
Stewart F. Taylor,
Region IX Administrator.
[FR Doc. 95–12165 Filed 5–6–95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–57–M

Maritime Administration

[Docket S–920]

Kadamanappattu Corp.; Notice of Application for Temporary Written Consent Pursuant to Section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as Amended, for the Temporary Transfer of the M/V STRONG/AMERICAN to the Domestic Trade

Notice is hereby given that Allen Freight Trailer Bridge (ATFB), by letter of April 25, 1995, requested written consent pursuant to section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Act), to temporarily transfer during the year commencing October 31, 1995, the construction-differential subsidy (CDS) built, M/V STRONG/AMERICAN, exclusively to the domestic trade for a period not to exceed six months in any year period. The M/V STRONG/AMERICAN is an integrated tug barge unit, built in the United States with the aid of CDS, and owned by Kadamanappattu Corp., an affiliate of AFTB.

ATFB states that it operates a weekly RO/RO barge service between Jacksonville, Florida, and San Juan, Puerto Rico, utilizing two RO/RO barges owned by Kadamanappattu Corp., the JAX-SAN JUAN BRIDGE and SAN JUAN-JAX BRIDGE. Each of these barges will require regulatory drydocking and repairs prior to February 28, 1996.

ATFB explains that the M/V STRONG/AMERICAN has a capacity equivalent of 56 percent of the RO/RO barges to be drydocked. The STRONG/AMERICAN will require drydocking at considerable expense before it can be