Transportation Department (NMSHTD), has decided to suspend preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS) on three alternative alignments for connecting NM 50 to I–25 in the vicinity of the Glorieta Unit of the Pecos National Historical Park.

In the late fall of 1996 the FHWA and NMSHTD concluded from the information prepared in the EIS study, from public and agency input received over the course of the study and from the lack of available funding, that an alternative outside the existing roadway corridor would not be in the best interest of the traveling public. Likewise, the FHWA/NMSHTD concluded that any improvements along the existing roadway corridor within the Pecos National Historical Park, Pigeon's Ranch Subunit, do not appear to be compatible with National Park Service preservation and interpretation commitments. Therefore this notice of EIS study suspension has been published in the Federal Register. Work to date is documented in an **Environmental Data Investigation** Report. This report is available for review in the Santa Fe offices of NMSHTD and FHWA.

Issued on: February 4, 1996. Reuben S. Thomas, *Division Administrator, Santa Fe, NM.* [FR Doc. 97–4463 Filed 2–21–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4010–22–M

### **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

### **Federal Highway Administration**

### Environmental Impact Statement: Worcester County, Maryland

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 project in Worcester County, Maryland.

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Ms. Renee Sigel, Planning, Research and Environment Team Leader, 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 and Worcester County, will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) on a proposal to improve US 113 in Worcester County.

The proposed improvement would address the project's purpose and need which is to improve safety and traffic flow along US 113 from Snow Hill to the Delaware State Line.

Improvements to this roadway are considered necessary because of the high number of fatal accidents in the study area. Additionally, an increase in travel demand is projected to lower the level of service of this roadway throughout the project area by the year 2020.

The alternatives under consideration include: (1) Taking no action, (2) construction improvements that are part of an integrated plan of phased safely and capacity improvements, as well as traffic management strategies, that would provide lower cost refinements to the existing transportation system without major alteration to the existing two lane highway, (3) dualization on existing alignment, (4) dualization on new alignment and (5) a combination of dualization on new alignment with dualizing US 113 in selected areas.

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 hearing will be held in May of 1997. 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. A formal scoping meeting for this project was held in May of 1995.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. [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 regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation of Federal Programs and activities apply to this program).

Issued on: February 12, 1997.

Renee Sigel,

Planning, Research and Environment Team Leader.

[FR Doc. 97-4379 Filed 2-21-97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910-22-M

### **Federal Railroad Administration**

[FRA Docket Number RST-95-3]

## Amendment to Petition for Waiver of Compliance

In accordance with Part 211 of Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), notice is hereby given that the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) received a request from the New York State Department of Transportation (NYDOT) for a waiver of compliance with certain requirements of 49 CFR Part 213, Track Safety Standards.

In its original request, NYDOT requested to operate the Rohr Turboliner trainsets at higher cant deficiencies on the Empire Corridor extending from New York City, New York, to Niagara Falls, New York, (see 60 Federal Register No. 230, November 30, 1995). Due to an FRA clerical error, the notice of NYDOT's request to add various types of equipment to its original petition did not clearly indicate that NYDOT seeks to add equipment owned by the Metro North Commuter Railroad as well as equipment owned by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

The second paragraph of the notice, Addendum to Petition for Waiver of Compliance (see 61 Federal Register No. 234, December 4, 1996), should read as follows: NYDOT now requests to add the National Railroad Passenger Corporation's (Amtrak) equipment and the following Metro North Commuter Railroad (Metro-North) equipment types: FL-9, FL-9 AC, Genesis I and II locomotives, Bombardier Shoreliner coaches. M-1 and M-3 electricpropelled coaches. NYDOT also proposes to limit its request to underbalance levels up to six inches and limit the territory of its request to that portion of the Empire Corridor extending between Penn Station, New York, and Poughkeepsie, New York, over track segments owned by Amtrak and Metro North.

Interested parties are invited to participate in these proceedings by submitting written views, data, or comments. FRA does not anticipate scheduling a public hearing in connection with these proceedings since the facts do not appear to warrant a hearing. If any interested party desires an opportunity for oral comment, they should notify FRA, in writing, before the end of the comment period and specify the basis for their request.

All communications concerning this proceeding should identify the appropriate docket number (e.g., Waiver

Petition Docket Number RST-95-3) and must be submitted in triplicate to the Docket Clerk, Office of Chief Counsel, FRA, Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590. Communications received within 30 days of the date of this notice will be considered by FRA before final action is taken. Comments received after that date will be considered as far as practicable. All written communications concerning these proceedings are available for examination during regular business hours (9:00 a.m.—5:00 p.m.) at FRA's temporary docket room located at 1120 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Room 7051, Washington, D.C. 20005.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on February 19, 1997.

Phil Olekszyk,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Compliance and Program Implementation. [FR Doc. 97–4487 Filed 2–21–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

### Notice of Application for Approval of Discontinuance or Modification of a Railroad Signal System or Relief From the Requirements of 49 CFR Part 236

Pursuant to 49 CFR Part 235 and 49 U.S.C. App. 26, the following railroads have petitioned the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) seeking approval for the discontinuance or modification of the signal system or relief from the requirements of 49 CFR Part 236 as detailed below.

Block Signal Application (BS-AP)-No. 3415

Applicant: Union Pacific Railroad Company, Mr. P. M. Abaray, Chief Engineer-Signals/Quality, 1416 Dodge Street, Room 1000, Omaha, Nebraska 68179–0001.

The Union Pacific Railroad Company seeks approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of signals 1636 and 1644, on the single main track automatic block signal system, near Hampton, Iowa, milepost 164.0, on the Mason City Subdivision.

The reason given for the proposed change is that the two signals are no longer needed.

BS-AP-No. 3416

Applicant: Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis, Mr. C. D. Trice, Manager Signals and Communications, 1201 McKinley Street, Venice, Illinois 62090.

The Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis seeks approval of the proposed relocation of automatic signal 211, southward a distance of 1,350 feet, near

Brooklyn, Illinois, on the Illinois Transfer District.

The reasons given for the proposed change are that the signal no longer serves the purpose for which it was intended, the relocation will improve functionality of the signal, make signal spacing more uniform and less confusing to train crews, and increase braking distance.

BS-AP-No. 3417

Applicant: Union Pacific Railroad, Mr. J. A. Turner, Engineer—Signals, Southern Pacific Building, One Market Plaza, San Francisco, California 94105.

The Union Pacific Railroad (former Southern Pacific Lines, St. Louis and Southwestern Railroad) seeks approval of the proposed modification of the traffic control system, on the single main track and siding, mileposts 339.9 and 340.9, near Herbert, Arkansas, Central Region, Midwest Division, Pine Bluff Subdivision, consisting of the following: discontinuance of East and West Herbert control points; conversion of the power-operated switches to hand operation; discontinuance and removal of controlled signals 62L, 62RA, and 60LA; conversion of controlled signal 60R to back-to-back automatic signals; and retention of the trailing siding signals in lieu of electric locks at each end of the siding.

The reason given for the proposed changes is that Herbert siding is no longer used to meet or pass trains, and is used as a storage track no longer requiring the power-operated switches.

BS-AP-No. 3418

Applicant: Union Railroad Company, Mr. J. J. Lacey, Assistant Vice President and General Manager, 135 Jamison Lane, P.O. Box 68, Monroeville, Pennsylvania 15146.

The Union Railroad Company seeks approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of a portion of the automatic block signals from the Munhall Branch, near West Mifflin, Pennsylvania, and govern train movements by yard limit rules.

The reason given for the proposed changes is that traffic and train movements have declined during recent years as a result of the retired Homestead Works steel plant, and traffic presently averages between 30 and 35 movements per week.

BS-AP-No. 3419

Applicant: Bessemer and Lake Erie Railroad Company, Mr. J. J. Lacey, Assistant Vice President and General Manager, 135 Jamison Lane, P.O. Box 68, Monroeville, Pennsylvania 15146. The Bessemer and Lake Erie Railroad Company seeks approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of the traffic control system, on the single main track, between "KO North End," milepost 93.5, near Adamsville, Pennsylvania and "RX Interlocking," milepost 123.8, near Albion, Pennsylvania, a distance of approximately 30 miles; and the associated installation of a Dispatcher Control Track Warrant System to govern train movements.

The reason given for the proposed changes is that traffic and train movements have declined during recent years with the vast reduction of ore and coal movements associated with declining steel operations, and traffic reductions do not support the expense to maintain the centralized traffic control system.

Any interested party desiring to protest the granting of an application shall set forth specifically the grounds upon which the protest is made, and contain a concise statement of the interest of the protestant in the proceeding. The original and two copies of the protest shall be filed with the Associate Administrator for Safety, FRA, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590 within 45 calendar days of the date of issuance of this notice. Additionally, one copy of the protest shall be furnished to the applicant at the address listed above.

FRA expects to be able to determine these matters without an oral hearing. However, if a specific request for an oral hearing is accompanied by a showing that the party is unable to adequately present his or her position by written statements, an application may be set for public hearing.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on February 19, 1997.

Phil Olekszyk,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Compliance and Program Implementation. [FR Doc. 97–4488 Filed 2–21–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY**

#### **Bureau of the Public Debt**

# **Proposed Collection: Comment Request**

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of the Treasury, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this