

financial assistance to the States' implementation of programs for the enforcement of (a) Federal rules, regulations, standards, and orders applicable to commercial motor vehicle safety and (b) compatible State rules, regulations, standards, and orders. This grant-in-aid program is known as the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP). The Intermodal Surface Transportation Safety Act of 1991 (ISTEA) added programs, such as drug interdiction, traffic enforcement, and size and weight activities to the core program established by the STAA.

Pursuant to the STAA, in order to qualify for a grant, participating States must submit a plan which is adequate to promote the objectives of Section 402 and meet a number of specified requirements. Section 402(c) of the STAA requires that the Secretary, on the basis of reports submitted by the State agency and the Secretary's own inspections make a continuing evaluation of the manner in which each State is carrying out its approved plan. This provision is implemented in 49 CFR 350.19 and Appendix B, paragraph G.

In order for the Secretary (i.e. Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]) to make this evaluation, it is necessary for the State to provide and/or maintain information concerning past, present, and future enforcement activity. The application by a State for a grant must contain the information required by 49 CFR 350.9 or 350.11, 350.13 and 350.15. This information is necessary to enable the FHWA to determine whether a State meets the statutory and administrative criteria to be eligible for a grant. It is necessary that a State's work activities and accomplishments be reported so that FHWA may monitor and evaluate a State's progress under its approved plan and make the determinations and decisions required of 49 CFR 350.19, 350.23, and 350.25.

The FHWA is required to determine whether any changes are needed in a State's efforts to meet the intended objectives of its plans. In the event of nonconformity to any approved plan and failure on the part of a State to remedy deficiencies, the FHWA is required to take action to cease Federal participation in the plan. The final rule in the **Federal Register**, Vol. 49, No. 189 was published September 27, 1984. The rules mandated by the ISTEA of 1991, which amend the STAA were published in the **Federal Register** on Tuesday, September 8, 1992 (57 FR 174).

*Respondents:* State MCSAP lead agencies.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden:* Basic Grant preparation: 2,240 hours; Special

Grant preparation: 1,120 hours; inspection data upload: 66,667 hours.

Interested parties are invited to send comments regarding any aspect of these information collections, including, but not limited to: (1) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the FHWA, including whether the information has practical utility; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the collected information; and (4) ways to minimize the collection burden without reducing the quality of the collected information.

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 315 and 49 CFR 1.48.

Issued On: August 13, 1997.

**George S. Moore,**

*Associate Administrator for Administration.*

[FR Doc. 97-22969 Filed 8-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Highway Administration

#### Environmental Impact Statement: Raleigh County, West Virginia

**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 highway improvement project in Raleigh County, West Virginia.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David A. Leighow, Division Environmental Coordinator, Federal Highway Administration, Geary Plaza, Suite 200, 700 Washington Street E., Charleston, WV 25301 Telephone: (304) 347-5268.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The FHWA, in cooperation with the West Virginia Division of Highways (DOH), will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed East Beckley Bypass, beginning on I-64 just east of Beckley and extending generally northward to connect with Appalachian Corridor L (US 19) at the existing interchange just east of the Crossroads Mall, a distance of approximately 11 km. A bypass is considered necessary to provide for the existing and projected traffic demand. Alternatives under consideration include (1) taking no action; (2) using alternate travel modes; (3) improve the existing system by constructing a four lane, limited access highway on a new location. Incorporated into the study with the various building alternatives will be

design variations of grade and alignment.

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate federal, state, and local agencies, and to private organizations and citizens who have previously expressed or are known to have an interest in this proposal. A public meeting will be held in Beckley after the draft EIS is available. In addition, a public hearing will be held. Public notice will be given of the time and place of the meeting and hearing. The Draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment prior to the public meeting. A scoping package will be distributed after this notice is published.

To ensure the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited. Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and the 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 regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation of federal programs and activities apply to this program.)

Issued on: August 20, 1997.

**David A. Leighow,**

*Environmental Coordinator, Charleston, West Virginia.*

[FR Doc. 97-22871 Filed 8-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-M

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Surface Transportation Board

[STB Docket No. MC-F-20910]

**Adirondack Transit Lines, Inc., Pine Hill-Kingston Bus Corp., and Passenger Bus Corporation—Pooling—Greyhound Lines, Inc., and Vermont Transit Co., Inc.**

**AGENCY:** Surface Transportation Board, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed revenue pooling application.

**SUMMARY:** Applicants, the Adirondack Group (Adirondack Transit Lines, d/b/a Adirondack Trailways (Adirondack), and its corporate affiliates, Pine Hill-Kingston Bus Corp., d/b/a Pine Hill Trailways (Pine Hill), and Passenger Bus Corporation, d/b/a New York Trailways (PBC), all of Kingston, NY) and the Greyhound System [Greyhound Lines, Inc. (Greyhound), of Dallas, TX, and its corporate affiliate, Vermont Transit Co.,

Inc. (Vermont), of Burlington, VT], jointly seek approval of a revenue pooling agreement under 49 U.S.C. 14302 with respect to their pooled motor passenger and package express transportation services between various points in New York, including services extending between New York, NY, and Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

**DATES:** Comments on the proposed agreement may be filed with the Board in the form of verified statements on or before September 29, 1997. If comments are filed, applicants' rebuttal statement is due on or before October 17, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Send an original and 10 copies of any comments referring to STB Docket No. MC-F-20910 to: Surface Transportation Board, Office of the Secretary, Case Control Unit, 1925 K Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20423-0001. In addition, send one copy of any comments to each of applicants' representatives: (1) Lawrence E. Lindeman, Suite 311, 218 N. Lee Street, Alexandria, VA 22314-2531; (2) Mark E. Southerst, Greyhound Lines, Inc., P.O. Box 660362, Dallas, TX 75266-0362; and (3) Fritz R. Kahn, Suite 750 West, 1100 New York Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20005-3934.

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

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In *Adirondack Transit Lines, Inc., Pine Hill-Kingston Bus Corp., and Passenger Bus Corporation—Pooling—Greyhound Lines, Inc., and Vermont Transit Company, Inc.*, STB No. MC-F-19190 (Sub-No. 1) (STB served Nov. 26, 1996), the Board approved, in addition to their existing pooled route between New York City and Albany, NY, a service pooling agreement between the Adirondack Group and the Greyhound System over routes that they both operate: (1) Between New York City, and Buffalo, NY; (2) between Albany and Buffalo; (3) between Albany and Long Island, NY; and (4) between New York City and Montreal, Quebec, Canada. These routes serve such intermediate points as Syracuse and Rochester, NY. Under the proposed arrangement, the Adirondack Group and the Greyhound System will also pool their passenger and package express revenues over all of these pooled routes.

Adirondack holds operating authority in No. MC-2835; Pine Hill, in No. MC-2060; and PBC, in No. MC-276393. The Adirondack Group operates more than 1,500 miles of intercity bus routes, predominantly in New York.

Greyhound holds operating authority in No. MC-1515; and Vermont, in No. MC-45626. The Greyhound System

operates more than 90,000 miles of intercity bus routes throughout the nation.

Applicants formerly were direct competitors over the pooled routes. Under their service pooling agreements, they state that they have been able to reduce the number of schedules each of them operates, while providing additional departure times. Applicants note that load factors on their buses have improved, making their operations more economical and efficient than they otherwise would have been. By pooling their revenues as well as their services on these routes, applicants expect to strengthen their commitment to providing safe, convenient, and comfortable bus transportation at reasonable and competitive fares, as each applicant will share financially in the vicissitudes of the pooled-route operations of the other. Applicants assert that their revenue pooling agreement will also facilitate the sharing of certain terminals, to the benefit of the traveling public. They note that they continue to experience keen competition from other modes of passenger travel in the region, including rail passenger service operated by Amtrak, air service operated by at least four airlines, and automobile travel over interstate highways.

Copies of the pooling application may be obtained free of charge by contacting applicants' representatives. A copy of this notice will be served on the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 10th Street & Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20530.

Decided: August 20, 1997.

By the Board, Chairman Morgan and Vice Chairman Owen.

**Vernon A. Williams,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97-22957 Filed 8-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915-00-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Surface Transportation Board

[STB Ex Parte No. 552 (Sub-No. 1)]

### Railroad Revenue Adequacy—1996 Determination

**AGENCY:** Surface Transportation Board, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of decision.

**SUMMARY:** On August 28, 1997, the Board served a decision announcing the 1996 revenue adequacy determinations for the Nation's Class I railroads. Three carriers (Illinois Central Railroad Company, Norfolk Southern Railroad

Company, and Soo Line Railroad Company) are found to be revenue adequate.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** This decision is effective August 28, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Leonard J. Blistein, (202) 565-1529. (TDD for the hearing impaired: (202) 565-1695.)

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Board is required to make an annual determination of railroad revenue adequacy. A railroad will be considered revenue adequate under 49 U.S.C. 10704(a) if it achieves a rate of return on net investment equal to at least the current cost of capital for the railroad industry for 1996, determined to be 11.9% in *Railroad Cost of Capital—1996*, STB Ex Parte No. 558 (STB served July 16, 1997). In this proceeding, the Board applied the revenue adequacy standards to each Class I railroad, and it found 3 carriers, Illinois Central Railroad Company, Norfolk Southern Railroad Company, and Soo Line Railroad Company, to be revenue adequate.

Additional information is contained in the Board's formal decision. To purchase a copy of the full decision, write to, call, or pick up in person from: DC NEWS & DATA, INC., Suite 210, 1925 K Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20423. Telephone: (202) 289-4357. (Assistance for the hearing impaired is available through TDD services (202) 565-1695.)

### Environmental and Energy Considerations

This action will not significantly affect either the quality of the human environment or the conservation of energy resources.

### Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 603(b), we conclude that our action in this proceeding will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The purpose and effect of the action is merely to update the annual railroad industry revenue adequacy finding. No new reporting or other regulatory requirements are imposed, directly or indirectly, on small entities.

Decided: August 14, 1997.

By the Board, Chairman Morgan and Vice Chairman Owen.

**Vernon A. Williams,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97-22960 Filed 8-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915-00-P