

D. Endangered species and other species identified as significant under law (e.g., marine mammals, migratory birds).

E. Marine, aquatic and terrestrial biodiversity, including species, genetic variety and ecosystems and the potential for invasive species to compromise such biodiversity; also ecosystem productivity and integrity, living resources and ecosystem services.

F. Environmental quality related to human health, including changes in environmental exposure to toxic substances (e.g., increases or decreases in exposure to pesticide residues on food).

G. Transboundary and global impacts may include those on:

1. Places not subject to national jurisdiction or places subject to shared jurisdiction, such as Antarctica, atmosphere (including ozone and climate change features), outer space, and the high seas;
2. Migratory species, including straddling and highly migratory fish stocks and whale;
3. Impacts relating to other environmental problems identified by the international community as having a global dimension and warranting a global response;
4. Transboundary impacts involving the boundaries of the United States.

### Appendix C: Structure and Content of Environmental Review Documents

This appendix provides details on the structure and content of the draft and final environmental review documents. In certain circumstances (e.g. confidentiality, compressed schedule) it may be necessary to adopt a modified documentation format, however, each ER document shall normally consist of the following sections:

- (1) Summary
- (2) Table of Contents
- (3) Objectives of the Proposed Trade Agreement
- (4) Scope of Environmental Impacts Reviewed
- (5) Environmental Impacts & Response Options
- (6) Findings and Conclusions
- (7) List of Preparers
- (8) Appendices

#### I. Guidance for Particular ER Document Sections

A. The *Objectives* section of the ER document should present an overview of the goals and negotiating history of the particular trade agreement under consideration. This section may highlight the perceived benefits of the agreement and related objectives for pursuing it.

B. The *Scope of Impacts* section should describe only those resources and/or regulations that were selected for review through the scoping process. This section

should not be a compendium of all potentially impacted areas, but only those considered by the ERG to be sufficiently important to warrant analysis in the ER. This section of the ER document should also provide a brief presentation of the rationale employed during the issue prioritization process and the criteria used for establishing the scope of the ER and eliminating issues deemed irrelevant.

C. The *Environmental Impacts* section of the document should describe the expected impacts of those negotiating positions selected for review, which should be compared to a base or baseline scenario that estimates conditions that would exist in the absence of the proposed trade agreement. The described impacts should include both beneficial and adverse impacts. This section should summarize the analytical methodology used in determining the environmental impacts, including assumptions made and uncertainties in the data and methodology (a description of the methodology may best be provided in an appendix). The Environmental Impacts section of the ER document may also include a description of actions proposed for addressing negative impacts and/or for enhancing beneficial consequences of the proposed trade agreement.

D. The *Conclusions* section of the document should summarize the potential environmental impacts expected from the proposed trade agreement, and may present options for addressing those impacts. This section of the document may also include discussion of any post-agreement actions when responsible agencies determine that such actions are warranted or desirable.

E. The number and nature of *Appendices* for each Environmental Review document will vary according to the nature of the trade agreement under review. In general, the use of appendices is encouraged whenever inclusion of technical and/or supporting data would improve clarity and aid in the understanding of the review process. At a minimum, a summary of key issues identified by the public during the ER process should be included as an appendix of both the draft and final ER documents.

[FR Doc. 00-17418 Filed 7-10-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190-01-U

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Highway Administration

#### Environmental Impact Statement: Fairfax County, Virginia

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is issuing this notice to advise the public of its intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement in cooperation with the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) for proposed improvements to the Capital Beltway (Interstate 495) in Fairfax County, Virginia for approximately 14 miles from Backlick Road (Route 617) to the American Legion Memorial Bridge at the Virginia/Maryland State line.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Edward Sundra, Environmental Specialist, Sr., Federal Highway Administration, Post Office Box 10249, Richmond, Virginia 23240-0249, Telephone 804-775-3338.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In 1997, a Major Investment Study (MIS) was completed in accordance with 23 CFR 450.318 which examined the transportation problems associated with the Capital Beltway in Virginia and identified possible solutions to address those problems as well as future transportation needs in the area. The MIS resulted in the determination that highway improvements which promote high occupancy vehicle (HOV) and bus transit use would be the most effective transportation investment to serve current and future demand on the Capital Beltway. The MIS also recommended that potential rail transit improvements serving the Capital Beltway corridor be studied on a regional basis by an appropriate transit agency or multi-jurisdictional team.

In 1998, FHWA and VDOT initiated the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process for the proposed recommendations resulting from the MIS. Based on a preliminary assessment of the project area and potential environmental impacts, FHWA and VDOT cooperatively agreed to prepare an Environmental Assessment in accordance with 40 CFR 1501.3(b) and 23 CFR 771.119(a) which permits the preparation of an Environmental Assessment when the significance of the environmental impacts are not clearly established and the preparation of the Environmental Assessment would assist agency decision making regarding the

need for an Environmental Impact Statement.

To provide additional definition to the MIS recommendations, alternatives for interchange improvements, mainline configurations, and direct HOV access were developed and evaluated.

Following an extensive and ongoing public involvement and outreach effort involving citizen workshops and information meetings, newsletters, a telephone hot-line, a website, and business/civic/neighborhood meetings, the alternatives were refined through an iterative screening process which determined the feasibility of implementing the various combinations of mainline configurations and interchange concepts. This screening process was based on engineering, operational, and environmental criteria. The most effective mainline and interchange combinations were combined into several "end-to-end" alternatives and carried forward for more detailed environmental analysis. Based on the initial results of this environmental analysis, it was determined that the proposed improvements to the Capital Beltway would result in greater environmental impacts than originally anticipated requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.

Alternatives being considered for improving the Capital Beltway include various combinations of the following: Widening the existing roadway, implementing lane management strategies such as HOV lanes or express/local lanes, reconstructing existing interchanges, and providing new direct access points for HOV traffic. Other alternatives being considered include the Transportation System Management alternative and the No-Build alternative. Additional information on the scope of the proposed Capital Beltway improvements and the alternatives that will be evaluated in the Environmental Impact Statement is available on the Internet at <http://project1.parsons.com/capitalbeltway>.

This Environmental Impact Statement will replace the Environmental Assessment currently being prepared by FHWA and VDOT for the proposed Capital Beltway while building upon the scoping, engineering, and environmental work as well as the public involvement effort conducted to date. As part of the early coordination for the Environmental Assessment, letters describing the proposed action and soliciting input were sent to the appropriate Federal, State and local agencies, private organizations, citizens, and interest groups who have expressed or are known to have an interest in this

proposal. Coordination with these agencies, organizations and individuals will continue as the Environmental Impact Statement is prepared. All Federal, State, and local agencies contacted during the early coordination for the Environmental Assessment will be notified of the FHWA's intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Capital Beltway improvements and provided an additional opportunity to comment on its proposed scope. Similar notice will be given to private organizations, citizens, and interest groups that have previously expressed or are known to have interest in this proposal. In addition, public input will continue to be solicited through the ongoing public involvement and outreach effort. Public hearings will be held when the draft Environmental Impact Statement is completed. Public notices will be given of the times and places of the hearings, and the draft Environmental Impact Statement will be available for public and agency review and comment prior to the public hearings. Finally, preparation of this Environmental Impact Statement will be coordinated closely with the Maryland State Highway Administration's Capital Beltway Corridor Transportation Study, the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation's Capital Beltway Corridor Rail Feasibility Study, and the Environmental Impact Statement currently being prepared for the Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project.

Although no formal scoping meeting is planned at this time, comments are invited from all interested parties to ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are identified and taken into account. Comments or questions concerning the proposed action and draft Environmental Impact Statement should be directed to FHWA at the address provided above.

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

**Authority:** 23 U.S.C. § 315; 49 CFR 1.48.

Issued on June 30, 2000.

**Edward S. Sundra,**

*Environmental Specialist, Sr.*

[FR Doc. 00-17485 Filed 7-10-00; 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 and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this 30-day notice announces that the Information Collection Requirement (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 and its expected burden. The **Federal Register** notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on the following collections of information was published on May 18, 2000 (65 FR 31624).

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before August 11, 2000.

**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 Dian Deal, Office of Information Technology and Productivity Improvement, RAD-20, Federal Railroad Administration, 1120 Vermont Ave., NW., Mail Stop 35, Washington, DC 20590 (telephone: (202) 493-6133). (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 issue two notices seeking public comment on information collection activities before OMB may approve paperwork packages. 44 U.S.C. 3506, 3507; 5 C.F.R. 1320.5, 1320.8(d)(1), 1320.12. On February 9, 2000, FRA published a 60-day notice in the **Federal Register** soliciting comment on ICRs that the agency was seeking OMB approval. 65 FR 6438. FRA received no comments in response to this notice.

Before OMB decides whether to approve these proposed collections of information, it must provide 30 days for public comment. 44 U.S.C. 3507(b); 5 CFR 1320.12(d). Federal law requires OMB to approve or disapprove paperwork packages between 30 and 60