roadways to avoid traffic congestion along mainline MD 210. The local roadway network in this area is not designed to handle the high volumes of through traffic being diverted from MD 210. The resulting congestion on the local roadway network compromises safety and contributes to the overall congestion in the MD 210 corridor.

The expected growth in local traffic from planned development in southern Prince George’s and Charles Counties will further aggravate existing conditions and will result in travel demand for exceeding the capacity of the existing transportation system, increasing congestion, travel times and accidents rates within the study area. This project will evaluate improvements to MD 210, which will address safety problems and accommodate existing and projected travel demand, provide the desired capacity and decrease travel delays and congestion.

The alternatives under consideration include (1) no-build, (2) intersection improvements, (3) widening to provide a fourth general-use lane, (4) widening to provide a two-lane reversible HOV facility in the median, and (5) construction of interchanges at six locations from Kirby Hill Road to Old Fort Road South. It has been determined that no single strategy could adequately address the need for this project. Therefore, a combination of the alternatives discussed above, along with multi-modal enhancements, such as Park & Ride facilities and improvements in the existing transit service, will be considered.

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, private organizations, and to citizens who have previously expressed or are known to have an interest in this project. A Public Hearing is tentatively scheduled for Fall, 2000. Public notice will be given of the time and place of this hearing.

The Draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment prior to the Public Hearing. Public notice will be given of the availability of the Draft EIS for review. A Formal scoping meeting was held for this project on August 15, 1997.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, a focus group comprised of local residents, business owners, elected officials, county representatives and SHA team members was formed in early 1997. The group has met regularly with a total of fourteen meetings to date. The group’s primary mission is to assist in the development of possible solution for the traffic congestion and safety concerns along the MD 210 corridor. As part of the ongoing alternatives development process, SHA is also maintaining extensive coordination with Prince George’s County, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG), Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) and Maryland Mass Transit Administration regarding the development of this project.

Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and EIS should be directed to the FHWA at the address provided above.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Research, Planning and Construction. The regulation directed to the FHWA at the address

Pamela Stephenson, Environmental Protection Specialist, The Rotunda-Suite 220, 711 West 40th Street, Baltimore Maryland 21211. Telephone: (410) 962–4342.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the Maryland State Highway Administration, will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on a proposal to improve MD 210 in Prince George’s County, Maryland. This project will consider a balanced and full range of Multi-Modal solutions, including intersection improvements, High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes, transit enhancement, and interchanges. The limits of the project are from MD 228 (Berry Road) to the Capital Beltway (I–95/I–495) a distance of approximately 10.2 miles.

MD 210 provides an essential connection between the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area, and residential communities in southern Prince George’s and northern Charles Counties, accommodating both local and long distance trips within the corridor. The MD 210 corridor within the study limits currently experience severe traffic congestion during morning and evening peak periods. Many commuters currently divert to county and local

Dated: Issued in Washington, DC on April 17, 2000.

Eric Gabler, Manager, Passenger Facility Charge Branch.

[FR Doc. 00–10546 Filed 4–27–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement
Prince George’s, County, MD

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an environmental impact statement will be prepared for a proposed multi-modal project in Prince George’s County, Maryland.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Pamela Stephenson, Environmental Protection Specialist, Federal Highway Administration, The Rotunda-Suite 220, 711 West 40th Street, Baltimore Maryland 21211. Telephone: (410) 962–4342.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the Maryland State Highway Administration, will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on a proposal to improve MD 210 in Prince George’s County, Maryland. This project will consider a balanced and full range of Multi-Modal solutions, including intersection improvements, High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes, transit enhancement, and interchanges. The limits of the project are from MD 228 (Berry Road) to the Capital Beltway (I–95/I–495) a distance of approximately 10.2 miles.

MD 210 provides an essential connection between the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area, and residential communities in southern Prince George’s and northern Charles Counties, accommodating both local and long distance trips within the corridor. The MD 210 corridor within the study limits currently experience severe traffic congestion during morning and evening peak periods. Many commuters currently divert to county and local roads to avoid traffic congestion along mainline MD 210. The local roadway network in this area is not designed to handle the high volumes of through traffic being diverted from MD 210. The resulting congestion on the local roadway network compromises safety and contributes to the overall congestion in the MD 210 corridor.

The expected growth in local traffic from planned development in southern Prince George’s and Charles Counties will further aggravate existing conditions and will result in travel demand for exceeding the capacity of the existing transportation system, increasing congestion, travel times and accidents rates within the study area. This project will evaluate improvements to MD 210, which will address safety problems and accommodate existing and projected travel demand, provide the desired capacity and decrease travel delays and congestion.

The alternatives under consideration include (1) no-build, (2) intersection improvements, (3) widening to provide a fourth general-use lane, (4) widen to provide a two-lane reversible HOV facility in the median, and (5) construction of interchanges at six locations from Kirby Hill Road to Old Fort Road South. It has been determined that no single strategy could adequately address the need for this project.

Therefore, a combination of the alternatives discussed above, along with multi-modal enhancements, such as Park & Ride facilities and improvements in the existing transit service, will be considered.

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, private organizations, and to citizens who have previously expressed or are known to have an interest in this project. A Public Hearing is tentatively scheduled for Fall, 2000. Public notice will be given of the time and place of this hearing.

The Draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment prior to the Public Hearing. Public notice will be given of the availability of the Draft EIS for review. A Formal scoping meeting was held for this project on August 15, 1997.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, a focus group comprised of local residents, business owners, elected officials, county representatives and SHA team members was formed in early 1997. The group has met regularly with a total of fourteen meetings to date. The group’s primary mission is to assist in the development of possible solution for the traffic congestion and safety concerns along the MD 210 corridor. As part of the ongoing alternatives development process, SHA is also maintaining extensive coordination with Prince George’s County, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG), Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) and Maryland Mass Transit Administration regarding the development of this project.

Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and EIS should be directed to the FHWA at the address provided above.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Research, Planning and Construction. The regulation directed to the FHWA at the address

Pamela Stephenson, Environmental Protection Specialist, The Rotunda-Suite 220, 711 West 40th Street, Baltimore Maryland 21211. Telephone: (410) 962–4342.

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

Reports, Forms and Recordkeeping Requirements Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review

AGENCY: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment No.</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Amendment approved date</th>
<th>Original approved net PFC revenue</th>
<th>Amended approved net PFC revenue</th>
<th>Original estimated charge exp. date</th>
<th>Amended estimated charge exp. date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94–02-U–02–TPA, Tampa, FL</td>
<td>03/22/00</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>04/01/01</td>
<td>12/01/00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95–01–C–02–HTS, Huntington, WV</td>
<td>03/23/00</td>
<td>99,932</td>
<td>368,432</td>
<td>04/01/00</td>
<td>07/01/00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94–01–C–01–OID, Cedar Rapids, IA</td>
<td>03/29/00</td>
<td>6,330,000</td>
<td>6,874,479</td>
<td>07/01/01</td>
<td>12/01/00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and its expected burden. The Federal Register Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on the following information collection was published on November 30, 1999 (64 FR 66961).

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before May 30, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Ron Ashby, (202) 358-7039, Office of Enforcement and Compliance, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, 400 7th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. Office hours are from 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Title:** Financial Responsibility for Motor Carriers of Passengers and Motor Carriers of Property.

**OMB Number:** 2126–0008.

**Type of Request:** Renewal of currently-approved information collections.

**Abstract:** Upon OMB approval for renewal of information collections, the FMCSA is requesting to combine two information collections into one as titled above. The 60-day Federal Register notice was published prior to OMB's assignment of new approval numbers to accommodate the FMCSA. Therefore, the Notice referenced the two collections under their former Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) OMB approval numbers as 2125–0518 and 2125–0518. They have subsequently been renumbered as 2126–0005 and 2126–0008. FMCSA is requesting that a combined collection maintain OMB Approval No. 2126–0008 and that 2126–0005 be canceled. The two collections, which differ only in regulated audiences, cover similar requirements for motor carriers to document their minimum levels of financial responsibility. Combining these two collections will not result in increased burdens.

The Secretary of Transportation is responsible for regulations which establish minimal levels of financial responsibility for (1) motor carriers of property to cover public liability, property damage, and environmental restoration and (2) for-hire motor carriers of passengers to cover public liability and property damage. The endorsement for Motor Carrier Policies of Insurance for Public Liability (Form MCS–90) and the Motor Carrier Public Liability Surety Bond (Form MCS–82) contain the minimum amount of information necessary to document that these levels have been obtained and are in effect. The information within these documents is used by the FMCSA and the public to verify that a motor carrier of property or passengers has obtained and has in effect the required minimum levels of financial responsibility.

**Respondents:** Insurance and surety companies of motor carriers of property (Form MCS–90 and Form MCS–82) and motor carriers of passengers (Form MCS–90B and Form MCS–82B).

**Average Burden per Response:** Two minutes to complete the endorsement for Motor Carrier Policies of Insurance for Public Liability or the Motor Carrier Public Liability Surety Bond; one minute to file the Motor Carrier Public Liability Surety Bond; one minute to have either document on board the vehicle (foreign-domiciled motor carriers only).

**Estimated Total Annual Burden:** 5,285 hours.

**Frequency:** Upon creation, change, or replacement of an insurance policy or surety bond.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention: DOT Desk Officer. Comments are invited on: Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility; the accuracy of the Department’s estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. A comment to OMB is most effective if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication of this Notice.

**Issued on:** April 20, 2000.

Bryan M. McLaughlin, Director Office of Policy, Plans, & Regulations, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. [FR Doc. 00–10547 Filed 4–27–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE** 4910–22–P

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

Federal Railroad Administration

**Petitions for Waiver of Compliance; Date and Location of Public Hearings**

The National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak), Maryland Mass Transit Administration (MTA), and San Diego Trolley, Inc. (SDTI) each seek a waiver of compliance from 49 CFR 238.203(d)(2) to allow the continued temporary usage of certain railroad passenger equipment that does not comply with FRA’s requirements for static end strength contained in 49 CFR 238.203(a)(1). Amtrak, MTA, and SDTI have petitioned FRA for “grandfathering” approval of this passenger equipment pursuant to 49 CFR 238.203(d), which allows the temporary usage of railroad passenger equipment not conforming to FRA’s static end strength requirements to continue while a petition for grandfathering approval is being processed, but not later than May 8, 2000, unless FRA has approved the petition. Amtrak, MTA, and SDTI seek to extend beyond the May 8, 2000 date the period during which passenger equipment that is the subject of the grandfathering petitions may operate, until a date that is 30 days after the date on which FRA acts finally on their grandfathering petitions. SDTI also seeks a waiver from the requirement to file a grandfathering petition before November 8, 1999. FRA announces that it will hold a public hearing on each of these waiver requests, as discussed in more detail below by railroad.

National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak)

[Docket No. FRA–2000–7199]

By public notice published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 14927), FRA announced the receipt of a petition from Amtrak for a waiver of compliance from the May 8, 2000 date specified in 49 CFR 238.203(d)(2) for cessation of the temporary usage of non-compliant railroad passenger equipment that is the subject of a grandfathering petition filed with FRA, absent FRA approval of the petition by that date. This waiver petition proceeding is identified as Docket No. FRA–2000–7199. On October 18, 1999, Amtrak had filed a grandfathering petition with FRA in which it requested approval to continue using five trainsets that do not meet the static end strength requirements contained in 49 CFR 238.203(a)(1). (This grandfathering petition proceeding is identified as Docket No. FRA–1999–6404.) In the April 11, 2000 notice, FRA invited comments from interested parties on Amtrak’s waiver request, and explained that any interested party requesting a public hearing on this request must do so, in writing, by April 20, 2000.

On April 20, 2000, FRA received a request from Bombardier, Inc., for a public hearing in connection with Amtrak’s waiver request in Docket No. FRA–2000–7199. Bombardier stated that a public hearing is essential on the basis that the waiver request, as currently...