

the need for a national mapping program and had several concerns with the August 26, 1997 notice. One operator agreed with RSPA's estimate for the burden hours per company. The other commentors stated that the burden hours were underestimated. One commentor did not provide numbers on the degree of the underestimate, while the other suggested two days per operator. RSPA's burden hour estimate was from an actual pre-pilot test of the mapping program. Because RSPA has actually pre-tested this program on operators some of whom had electronic maps and some who had only paper maps, RSPA stands by its burden hour estimates. The one dissenting commentor also raised issues concerning the need and value of NPMS, the accuracy of the maps required under the pilot program, the costs of the regional repositories, and the costs and benefits of a truly national mapping program.

RSPA believes that access to a complete and accurate NPMS is necessary to ensure that RSPA has the best information for its emergency response, compliance and enforcement responsibilities. RSPA further believes that it is important that its state partners also have this same information. It is important to note that this mapping program is a joint effort of the Federal government, state agencies, and the three major trade organizations representing the natural gas and hazardous liquid industries, the American Petroleum Institute (API), the American Gas Association (AGA), and the Interstate Natural Gas Association Of America (INGAA). The accuracy of the information required of these maps is to within 500 feet and the maps must have a quality code describing the quality of the data provided. The Federal Government has provided \$2.4 million for the NPMS system prior to 1997. It has budgeted \$500,000.00 for 1997 with an estimated \$400,000.00 needed annually thereafter to maintain this repository system. While RSPA does not have an estimate of the potential costs and benefits of a national mapping network it is hoping that information provided by this pilot program will help RSPA estimate the net benefits of a national mapping system in the future if that is required. The question for now is to test a volunteer mapping pilot program.

**DATES:** Comments on this notice must be received on or before December 15, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Marvin Fell, (202) 366-6205 or write by E-mail to Fellm@rspa.dot.gov., Research

and Special Programs Administration, Room 8102, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA)

*Title:* Mapping Pilot Program.

*OMB Control Number:* 2137-NEW.

*Type of Request:* New Collection.

*Affected Public:* Gas transmission and hazardous liquid operators.

*Abstract:* The Department of Transportation (DOT) along with other Federal and state agencies have been working side by side with natural gas and hazardous liquid operators to develop a national pipeline mapping system (NPMS). This system, when complete, will depict and provide data on the natural gas transmission and larger liquid pipelines operating in the United States. The DOT is beginning a volunteer pilot program consisting of 36 pipeline operators (three from each of 12 states participating in the program). These 36 pipeline operators will provide electronic maps of 10-20 miles of their pipeline to one state as well as to one of six regional repositories for their startup and operating costs.

*Estimated Annual Burden Hours:* 144 hours.

*Number of Respondents:* 48.

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.

Issued in Washington, DC on November 5, 1997.

**Vanester M. Williams,**

*Clearance Officer, United States Department of Transportation.*

[FR Doc. 97-30024 Filed 11-13-97; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-62-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Federal Highway Administration**

**Environmental Impact Statement, Trumbull, Monroe and Newtown, CT**

**AGENCY:** Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Revised notice of intent.

**SUMMARY:** The FHWA is issuing this Notice to advise the public that an Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared for a proposed highway project in Trumbull, Monroe, and Newtown, Connecticut. A notice of Intent to prepare an EIS was published in the **Federal Register** on July 25, 1985. Instead, an Environmental Assessment will be prepared.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Donald J. West, Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, 628-2 Hebron Ave., Suite 303, Glastonbury, CT 06033-5007, Telephone: (860) 659-6703 extension 3009; Mr. Edgar Hurlle, Director of Environmental Planning, Bureau of Policy and Planning, 3800 Berlin Turnpike, P.O. Box 317546, Newington, CT 06131-7546, Telephone: (860) 594-2920.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Existing State Route 25 is a major arterial from Interstate 95 in Bridgeport, Connecticut to U.S. Route 7 in Brookfield, Connecticut. The corridor under study involves the section from State Route 111 in Trumbull to Interstate 84 in Newtown. Following the Notice of Intent for the preparation of a Draft EIS, project scoping and preparation of the document began. Multiple expressway alternatives on new alignment were studied, as well as a widening of existing Route 25 with a 100 foot right of way for a length of approximately 11 miles. A minimal widening of the existing road with a 75 foot right of way and approximate length of 10 miles was also studied. In 1992, a strategic financial plan was developed by the Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT). This plan reevaluated major transportation project in light of transportation needs and financial constraints. Based on this plan, as well as severe environmental concerns of the expressway alternatives, the ConnDOT decided to narrow the scope of the project to only the widening alternative which has the least environmental and socio-economic impacts of all previously studied alternatives. No significant impacts are foreseen from the limited widening.

In light of the change of scope of the project, the FHWA and the ConnDOT agree that the foreseen impacts of this

project no longer warrant an EIS. An Environmental Assessment will be prepared and processed to fully analyze the proposal.

(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 program)

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

Issued on: October 31, 1997.

**Donald J. West,**

*Division Administrator, Glastonbury, Connecticut.*

[FR Doc. 97-29924 Filed 11-13-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-M

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Railroad Administration

#### Notice of Safety Advisory

**AGENCY:** Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of safety advisory amendment.

**SUMMARY:** FRA is amending Safety Advisory 97-1, which addresses safety practices to reduce the risk of casualties from train derailments caused by damage to tracks, roadbed, and bridges resulting from uncontrolled flows of water and similar weather-related phenomena, by revising the recommendation concerning the transmission of flash flood warnings to train dispatchers or other employees controlling the movement of trains.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Gordon A. Davids, P.E., Bridge Engineer, Office of Safety Assurance and Compliance, FRA, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., RRS-15, Mail Stop 25, Washington, D.C. 20590 (telephone 202-632-3340) or Daniel L. Alpert, Trial Attorney, Office of Chief Counsel, FRA, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., RCC-12, Mail Stop 10, Washington, D.C. 20590 (telephone 202-632-3186).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On September 4, 1997, FRA issued Safety Advisory 97-1 (SA 97-1) (62 FR 46793), recommending that railroads take certain actions to reduce the risk of train derailments which could result from severe weather conditions, particularly undetected flash floods. The first recommendation of SA 97-1 reads as follows:

1. The railroad should have in place a procedure that will assure that all notifications issued by the National Weather Service (NWS) of flash flood warnings will be received within 15 minutes of issuance from

the NWS, directly or through a contract weather forecasting service, by the train dispatchers or other employees controlling the movement of trains on all track of Class 4 or higher or upon which passenger trains operate in commuter or intercity service, within the warning area. In the case of such track located outside of the warning area but subject to damage from water resulting from the storm, the information should be obtained in time to permit timely response by the railroad.

The intent of the recommendation is for all flash flood warnings issued by the NWS for the area in which an affected railroad operates to be received by the personnel who control train operations in the area of the warning. It is not necessary that the warning come directly from the NWS, but it should be received intact and in a timely manner.

Since SA 97-1 was issued, FRA has become aware of several circumstances in which large railroads with centralized dispatching operations have contracted with specialized weather services for weather information tailored to the situation and requirements of the railroad. Several of those contract services do not pass on all NWS warnings, but instead analyze the warnings in the light of other weather data available to them and their knowledge of the specific situation and requirements of their clients in order to provide only the weather information that affects the client and to filter out irrelevant information. This process reduces the amount of information that the client is required to consider and evaluate, and allows the client to focus on information that, in the view of the contract weather service, might actually affect the client's property and operations.

FRA now believes that this procedure offered by contract weather services might meet the requirements of some railroads better than if all NWS warnings are passed on by the contract weather service en masse, regardless of their relevance to the individual railroad. Therefore, Safety Advisory 97-1 is amended in part by revising Recommendation 1 to read as follows:

1. The railroad should have in place a procedure that will assure that the train dispatchers or other employees controlling the movement of trains on all track of Class 4 or higher or upon which passenger trains operate in commuter or intercity service will receive timely warnings of any flash flood that might damage that track or its supporting structures. In the case of such track located outside of the warning area but subject to damage from water resulting from the storm, the information should be obtained in time to permit timely response by the railroad. The warning procedure should incorporate either:

a. The means to receive within 15 minutes of issuance by the National Weather Service (NWS) all NWS flood warnings for the area in which the track is located; or

b. An arrangement with a competent commercial weather service which receives and reviews warnings and weather data from the NWS as part of its warning procedures, and from which the railroad receives warnings and weather information that is specific to the situation and requirements of the railroad.

Issued in Washington, DC, on November 10, 1997.

**George A. Gavalla,**

*Acting Associate Administrator for Safety.*

[FR Doc. 97-30032 Filed 11-13-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-06-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Research and Special Programs Administration

#### International Standards on the Transport of Dangerous Goods; Public Meeting

**AGENCY:** Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA), Department of Transportation.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting.

**SUMMARY:** This notice is to advise interested persons that RSPA will conduct a public meeting to report on the results of the fourteenth session of the United Nation's Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods (UNSCOE) and to discuss the work program for U.S. participation in future meetings of the UN Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods during the 1997-1998 biennium.

**DATES:** January 6, 1998 at 9:30 a.m.

**ADDRESSES:** Room 8236-8240 Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Frits Wybenga, International Standards Coordinator, Office of Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, Washington, DC 20590; (202) 366-0656.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The primary purpose of this meeting will be to (1) review the outcome of the fourteenth session of the UNSCOE held from December 8-18, 1997 in Geneva Switzerland and to begin preparation for U.S. participation in the fifteenth session of the UNSCOE. Topics to be covered during the public meeting include matters related to reformatting the UN Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods into a model rule, criteria for environmentally hazardous substances, review of