

certification responsibilities under the Act. Since then, both the Prince William Sound and Cook Inlet advisory groups have been recertified annually. Based on the experiences of the recertification processes conducted from 1993 to 2000, as well as the evolution of the advisory groups from new, untested organizations to stable, functioning organizations, the Coast Guard believes the recertification procedure should be streamlined, reducing the annual administrative burden placed on the advisory groups, the Coast Guard, and the public. Hence, the Coast Guard published a notice of proposal to change procedure; request for comments on December 28, 2000 (65 FR 82451) that asked the public to comment on the proposal to change recertification procedure. Three commenters, including the two advisory groups, submitted comments. All three commenters endorsed the proposed procedural changes for certification. All three commenters agreed that the current annual recertification process involves a lot of time and effort. The commenters also agreed that much of the information that is required remains unchanged from year to year, thus rendering it redundant.

However, one commenter proposed a minor modification to the clause within the proposal that states that "for each of the 2 years between the triennial application procedure, applicants should * * * describe any substantive changes to the information provided at the last triennial recertification." The commenter said that, if this clause is interpreted literally, this provision would appear to require that changes occurring during the first off-year, and described in the application for that year, be described again in the application for the second off-year. The commenter stated that this would be necessary to ensure that all changes since the last triennial recertification were captured in each off-year application. The commenter suggested instead that each off year application be required to capture only changes since the last recertification, without regard to whether it was a triennial recertification or an off-year recertification. This commenter added that a simplified process of recertification would:

- Materially reduce the administrative burden on the Coast Guard and other parties to the process.
- Preserve an appropriate degree of oversight of RCAC activities by the Coast Guard.
- Provide appropriate opportunities for public comment on RCAC activities. Our experience gathered from 1993 to present has shown us that the majority

of information submitted by advisory groups seeking recertification remains unchanged year-to-year and both the government and the public would benefit from a streamlined administrative procedure. Based on the comments received and on that experience, we believe an applicant for recertification should provide the Coast Guard with a comprehensive application once every 3 years (triennially). For each of the 2 years between the triennial application procedures, applicants should submit a letter requesting recertification and describe any substantive changes to the information provided at the last triennial recertification. We propose that this procedure commences with the 2002 certification season, meaning that applicants seeking recertification in 2002 need only submit the streamlined application and that we will not solicit public comments prior to recertification during 2002. The triennial review process will take place in 2005. The Coast Guard will still accept public comments whenever submitted and these comments will be available for viewing by making arrangements with the office listed under **ADDRESSES**.

Dated: September 6, 2002.

Joseph J. Angelo,

Director of Standards, Marine Safety, Security and Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 02-23481 Filed 9-13-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: Fort Bend County, TX

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 transportation project in Fort Bend County, Texas.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. John Mack, P.E., Federal Highway Administration, Texas Division, 300 East 8th Street, Room 826, Austin, Texas 78701, Telephone (512) 536-5960.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and Fort Bend County, will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on a proposal to upgrade the existing transportation network in Fort Bend County. The proposed project would be for the development of Segment B of

State Highway 122 (Fort Bend Parkway) from State Highway 6 to segment C of SH 99 (the Grand Parkway) in Fort Bend County, Texas. The proposed action would be a multilane, possibly tolled, facility, approximately 13 miles in length, built within a corridor with the above limits. The majority of this corridor crosses relatively undeveloped properties in Fort Bend County. Cities and towns in the region include Pearland, Arcola, Missouri City and Thompsons.

Fort Bend County proposes to build a facility to provide improved transportation characteristics in the region.

Alternatives to be studied include "no-action" (the no-build alternative), Transportation System Management (TSM)/Transportation Demand Management (TDM) alternative, mass transit alternative and roadway build alternatives.

Potential impacts caused by the construction and operation of the facility will vary for each reasonable alternative alignment considered. Generally, impacts would include the following: transportation impacts (construction detours, construction traffic and mobility improvement), air and noise impacts from construction equipment and operation of the facility, water quality impacts from construction area and roadway storm water runoff, impacts to waters of the United States, including wetlands from right-of-way encroachment, impacts to historic and archaeological resources, impacts to floodplains, impacts to residents and businesses caused by potential displacements and impacts to vegetation that may provide potential habitat to wildlife or other biological resources.

Letters describing the proposed action soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, State, local agencies, and to private organizations and citizens who have previously expressed or are known to have interest in this proposal. Two simultaneous public scoping meetings will be held on October 15th, 2002, one at Manford Williams Elementary School, 1.5 miles west of Crabb-River Rd. on FM 762 and the other at Sienna Crossing Elementary School, 0.5 miles east of Sienna Parkway on Steep Bank Trace. Both meetings will be at 7 P.M. Public comments on the proposed action and alternatives will be requested. This will be the first of a series of meetings to evaluate the study area, corridor alternatives and design alternative alignments. A public hearing will be held at a later time, with copies of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) available for public and agency

review and comment prior to the public hearing.

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 the Environmental Impact Statement should be directed to the 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 governmental consultation on federal programs and activities apply to this program).

Issued on: September 4, 2002.

John R. Mack,

District Engineer, FHWA Texas Division.

[FR Doc. 02-23485 Filed 9-13-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

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

AGENCY: Maritime 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 notice announces that the Information Collection abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The nature of the information collection is described as well as its expected burden. The **Federal Register** notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on the following collection of information was published on June 21, 2002. No comments were received.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before October 16, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Elizabeth Gearhart, Maritime Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202-366-1867, FAX 202-366-7901, or e-mail:

elizabeth.gearhart@marad.dot.gov.

Copies of this collection can be obtained from that office.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Maritime Administration (MARAD).

Title: Shipbuilding Orderbook and Shipyard Employment.

OMB Control Number: 2133-0029.

Type of Request: Extension of currently approved information collection.

Affected Public: Owners of U.S. shipyards who agree to complete the requested information.

Form(s): MA-172.

Abstract: In compliance with the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, MARAD conducts this survey to obtain information from the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry to be used primarily to determine if an adequate mobilization base exists for the national defense and for use in a national emergency.

Annual Estimated Burden Hours: 400 hours.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503, Attention MARAD Desk Officer.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) 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 best assured of having its full effect if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication.

Issued in Washington, DC on September 9, 2002.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 02-23487 Filed 9-13-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-81-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 34235]

Genesee & Wyoming Inc.—Control Exemption—Utah Railway Company and Salt Lake City Southern Railroad Company

Genesee & Wyoming Inc. (GWI), a noncarrier, has filed a notice of exemption to acquire control through the acquisition of all of the stock of Utah Railway Company (UTAH),¹ and its

¹ UTAH is a wholly owned subsidiary of Arava Natural Resources Company, Inc., which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Mueller Industries, Inc.

wholly owned subsidiary, the Salt Lake City Southern Railroad Company (SLCS). UTAH is a Class III carrier² operating in Utah and Colorado and SLCS is a Class III carrier operating in Utah.

The proposed transaction was scheduled to be consummated on or after August 27, 2002, the effective date of the exemption (7 days after the notice was filed).

GWI directly controls one Class II carrier, Buffalo & Pittsburgh Railroad, Inc., operating in New York and Pennsylvania, and the following Class III carriers: Allegheny & Eastern Railroad, Inc., operating in Pennsylvania; Bradford Industrial Rail, Inc., operating in Pennsylvania and New York; Corpus Christi Terminal Railroad, Inc., operating in Texas; Dansville and Mount Morris Railroad Company, operating in New York; Genesee & Wyoming Railroad Company, Inc., operating in New York; Golden Isles Terminal Railroad, Inc., operating in Georgia; Savannah Port Terminal Railroad Inc., operating in Georgia; Illinois & Midland Railroad, Inc., operating in Illinois; Louisiana & Delta Railroad, Inc., operating in Louisiana; Pittsburgh & Shawmut Railroad, Inc., operating in Pennsylvania; Portland & Western Railroad, Inc., operating in Oregon; Rochester & Southern Railroad, Inc., operating in New York; South Buffalo Railway Company, operating in New York; and Willamette & Pacific Railroad, Inc., operating in Oregon.

GWI indirectly controls three Class III carriers through its ownership of noncarrier Rail Link, Inc.: Carolina Coastal Railway, Inc., operating in North Carolina; Commonwealth Railway, Inc., operating in Virginia; and Talleyrand Terminal Railroad, Inc., operating in Florida. GWI also indirectly controls three Class III carriers through its ownership of Emons Transportation Group, Inc. (Emons), and its noncarrier holding company, Emons Railroad Group, Inc.: York Railway Company (York), operating in Pennsylvania;³ St. Lawrence & Atlantic Railroad Company, operating in Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine; and St. Lawrence & Atlantic

² GWI states that, although UTAH has operated as a Class III carrier, its revenue increases in recent years may qualify it as a Class II railroad.

³ Through its control of Emons, GWI also controls two non-operating Class III carriers which separately hold the rail assets over which York operates; Maryland and Pennsylvania Railroad, LLC and Yorkrail, LLC. See *Maryland and Pennsylvania Railroad Company and Yorkrail, Inc.—Intracorporate Family Transaction Exemption*, STB Finance Docket No. 33815 (STB served Dec. 13, 1999).