

potential for prolonged conflicts and litigations.

- Promotion of mutual understanding and interests.

2. Guiding Principles

In the early stages of their effort, the Working Group crafted a set of guiding principles for pipeline cost-benefit analyses. The Working Group agreed on fourteen principles that should guide the evaluation of pipeline safety cost-benefit analyses. RSPA intends to refine or modify these guiding principles whenever needed to be consistent with changes in economic theory and methods. Throughout the effort, the Working Group exercised care to ensure that the guiding principles and the cost-benefit framework reflect and are consistent with standard accepted economic concepts and practices. One major reference for the Working Group in developing the guiding principles and framework is the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) guidance for economic analyses.

3. Framework

As envisioned by the Working Group, the framework consists of a process for interaction among stakeholders representing the government, industry, environmental, and safety constituencies, and the public. The Working Group's report, *A Collaborative Framework for Office of Pipeline Safety Cost-Benefit Analyses*, describes each of the major process components of the framework and gives detailed guidance to carry out each process component. The major process components in the framework are:

- Identifying and defining the target problem.
- Identifying all available alternatives for addressing the target problem.
- Defining the analytical baseline.
- Defining the scope of the analysis.
- Analyzing costs.
- Analyzing benefits.
- Interpreting and using cost-benefit results.
- Evaluating the value and effectiveness of the cost-benefit process.

4. Illustrative Case Study—Pipeline Mapping

Since extensive cost data are available for RSPA's voluntary pipeline mapping initiative, the Working Group elected to do a cost-benefit analysis of this initiative. This case study provided the Working Group a way to illustrate, test, and refine the framework. The Working Group report presents the analytical

results of this case study, reviews the challenges inherent to the application of the framework to analyze the costs and benefits of the initiative, and describes the "lessons learned."

RSPA invites discussions and comments on the Cost-Benefit Analysis Framework Working Group's final report, *A Collaborative Framework for Office of Pipeline Safety Cost-Benefit Analyses*.

Issued in Washington, DC on August 2, 1999.

Richard B. Felder,

Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.

[FR Doc. 99-20295 Filed 8-5-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 29653 (Sub-No. 7)]

Transportacion Ferroviaria Mexicana—Pooling of Car Service Regarding Multilevel Cars

AGENCY: Surface Transportation Board.

ACTION: Notice of filing of application.

SUMMARY: Transportacion Ferroviaria Mexicana (TFM) has filed an application seeking approval for its participation in an existing railroad agreement for the pooling of services related to multilevel cars used to transport motor vehicles and boxcars used to transport automobile parts. TFM is a common carrier engaged in the transportation of property by railroad in Mexico. Its participation in the pooling agreement will be limited to international traffic moving between points in Mexico, the United States, and Canada.

DATES: Any comments on the application must be filed by September 7, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Send an original plus 10 copies of any comments, referring to STB Finance Docket No. 29653 (Sub-No. 7), to the Surface Transportation Board, Office of the Secretary, Case Control Unit, 1925 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20423-0001. In addition, send one copy of any comments to: (1) The U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 10th Street & Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20530; and (2) Jamie J. Rainey, 100 West Big Beaver, Suite 200, Troy, MI 48084.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Beryl Gordon, (202) 565-1600. [TDD for the hearing impaired: (202) 565-1695.]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under 49 U.S.C. 11322, the Board may approve pooling agreements that are voluntarily entered into by carriers, provided that the pooling or division of traffic, services, or earnings will be in the interest of better service to the public or of economy of operation and will not unreasonably restrain competition. The pooling agreement that TFM seeks to join was originally approved by the Board's predecessor, the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), in *The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, et al.—Pooling of Car Service Regarding Multi-Level Cars*, Finance Docket No. 29653 (ICC served Aug. 29, 1981). That agreement applied only to multilevel cars. Subsequently, the ICC approved amendments to the agreement authorizing the pooling of railroad services in auto-parts boxcars in *The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, et al.—Pooling of Car Service Regarding Multi-Level Cars*, Finance Docket No. 29653 (Sub-No. 3) (ICC served Apr. 18, 1986). Other modifications included adding additional carriers to the pool, such as Canadian Pacific Limited in *The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, et al.—Pooling of Car Service Regarding Multi-Level Cars*, Finance Docket No. 29653 (Sub-No. 1) (ICC served Apr. 12, 1983), and Canadian National Railway Company in *The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, et al.—Pooling of Car Service Regarding Multi-Level Cars*, Finance Docket No. 29653 (Sub-No. 2) (ICC served May 12, 1983). The agreement was last amended in *The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, et al.—Pooling of Car Service Regarding Multilevel Cars*, Finance Docket No. 29653 (Sub-No. 6) (ICC served June 30, 1995). It was revised to enable railroads and shippers to obtain and use information that they otherwise would not have, thereby allowing pool members to increase the efficiency of distribution of the multilevel car fleet and minimize unnecessary investment.¹

By the Board, David M. Konschnik,
Director, Office of Proceedings.

Decided: July 29, 1999.

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99-20053 Filed 8-5-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915-00-P

¹ The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) initially objected to the amendment as it was originally proposed, but withdrew its objection after the railroads revised the amendment to meet DOJ's concerns.