the presentation of that information at a summary or program level. However, station information for major passenger and freight intermodal connections and facilities is an explicit provision in PRIIA, and remains a part of the guidance. Lastly, the guidance was revised to call for “summary level of discussion” on land use impacts.

A commenter expressed concern for reporting station-to-station intrastate ridership for any but the top ten city pairs, proposing that States simply rid ridership for any but the top ten city reporting station-to-station intrastate discussion’’ on land use impacts. A commenter recommended adding a comprehensive profile of current usage is a critical component to preparation of a credible State rail plan, and limiting ridership flows to the top city pairs will not provide useful information on growth trends in small and mid-sized markets. Therefore, no change has been made.

Several commenters proposed not collecting information on the owner/operator status of rail lines, citing the difficulty, expense, and inconsistency with PRIIA. Response: Owner/operator status of rail lines as a key element of the inventory of the existing rail services and facilities within the State, which is an explicit requirement of PRIIA. The guidance has been revised to identify the availability of the data in GIS format from the National Transportation Atlas Database (NTAD), which is maintained online by the U.S. Department of Transportation. In addition, information on publicly funded commuter rail operations should be available through the MPO if in an urbanized area or State if in a non-urbanized area.

A commenter regarded “railway assets currently out of service or rail banked’’ as abandoned and expressed concern for the burden of assembling an inventory of those lines. Response: Rail-banked and out of service rail lines have not been formally abandoned and therefore remain important rail facilities to be inventoried.

A commenter recommended adding a section on passenger station needs and plans. Response: FRA agrees that station planning, including consideration of usage, station area development and interfaces with other modes, is important and the topic has been added to the guidance.

A commenter suggested that evaluation of passenger rail projects for impact on livability, land use, and walkability would be too detailed for a statewide level document describing projects at the systems planning stage of development. Response: FRA has revised the guidance to call for analysis of land use impacts only for those projects that have reached the environmental analysis phase, with a summary discussion of land use impacts required elsewhere.

A commenter requested that FRA provide benefit-cost formulas for use by States. Response: Currently, FRA does not have specific guidance on benefit-cost analyses but may be able to provide technical assistance upon request. However, the DOT Office of Inspector General recently released a report highlighting best practices in conducting rail benefits assessments, available at: http://www.oig.dot.gov/sites/dot/files/OIG–HSR-Best-Practice–Public-Benefits-Report.pdf. Additionally, benefit-cost guidance used for the TIGER grant program can be used to structure a rail analysis: http://www.dot.gov/sites/dot.dev/files/docs/TIGER%202013%20NOFA_BCA%20Guidance_0.pdf.

A commenter requested more information on the list of performance measures proposed in Appendix 1 for possible inclusion in Section 2.1. Response: The guidance was not revised because the measures were listed as optional information items offered for consideration, subject to their availability.

A commenter suggested that ridership information may not be available from more than 5 years prior and proposed modifying the request to apply to only the previous five years. Another commenter noted that passenger train miles (adjusted for cancellations/terminations) is typically available only from Amtrak. Another commenter proposed that passenger mile data be provided on a route basis. Response: FRA has revised the guidance to request data only for only the past 5 years, with States encouraged to use data from earlier years if they have it. The guidance also was revised to advise that “general estimates” of passenger mile data are acceptable for state-supported services, with route-level data acceptable for long-distance trains.

A commenter expressed concern for the lack of intercity rail mode share data, as required by the draft guidance for State rail plans. Response: FRA has revised the guidance to require inclusion of mode share data only if it is available, or able to be calculated, through the use of existing information. A commenter suggested that commuter rail mode share be calculated as commuter rail trips per total public transit trips. Response: FRA has retained the definition given in the draft guidance in order to provide a consistent measurement standard for all State rail plans. Individual States may optionally choose additional measures and alternative definitions of mode share if they wish.

Availability of Final Guidance
Notice is hereby given that FRA has released final State Rail Plan Guidance, which is available at: http://www.fra.dot.gov/Page/P0511. The purpose of FRA’s final State Rail Plan Guidance is to describe the processes for the development, submission, and acceptance of State rail plans. State rail plans are documents that are required under Section 303 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008.

Paul Nissenbaum,
Associate Administrator for Railroad Policy and Development.
[FR Doc. 2013–22679 Filed 9–17–13; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Maritime Administration
Marine Transportation System National Advisory Council

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of request for applications.

SUMMARY: The Maritime Administration (MarAd) is seeking applications for membership on the Marine Transportation System National Advisory Council (MTSNAC). The Council advises and makes recommendations to the Secretary of Transportation (Secretary) via the Maritime Administrator on impediments to the effective use and expansion of America’s Marine Highways; waterways and ports, and their intermodal, road, rail, and marine highway connections; shipbuilding capacity; and guidelines for the development of a national freight policy from a marine transportation perspective.

DATES: MTSNAC applications should be received on or before October 18, 2013.

ADDRESSES: Submit your application by mail, email, or facsimile to MarAd–MTSNAC Designated Federal Officer, Room W21–310, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590. Email: nac.marad@dot.gov. Fax: (202) 366–6988.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Richard Lolich, MTSNAC Designated Federal Officer, Maritime Administration, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Room W21–310, Washington, DC 20590, Richard.Lolich@
The MTSNAC is an advisory committee established in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) 5 U.S.C. App. 2 (Public Law 92–463) and the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140). The MTSNAC advises, consults with, reports to, and makes recommendations to the Secretary on matters relating to the Marine Transportation System. Such matters may include, but are not limited to:

- Impediments that hinder the effective use and expansion of America’s Marine Highways, and the expanded use of the marine transportation system for freight and passengers;
- Waterways and ports, and their intermodal road, rail, and marine highway connections and actions required to meet current and future national transportation system integration needs;
- Strategy, policy and goals to ensure an environmentally responsible and safe system that improves the global competitiveness and national security of the U.S.;
- Guidelines for the development of a national freight policy from a marine transportation perspective; and
- Such other matters, related to those above, that the Secretary or sponsor may charge the Council with addressing.

The full council normally meets at least two to three times per fiscal year. The MTSNAC subcommittees may hold meetings and teleconferences more frequently, as needed. It may also meet for extraordinary purposes.

Application Request

If you are interested in applying to become a member of the Council, you may request an application by contacting the MTSNAC Designated Federal Officer [See the section entitled FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT listed above]. When requesting the application, please include your contact information so that we may send the application form to you. Once you have completed your application, send it to Mr. Richard Lolich, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) of the Marine Transportation System National Advisory Council in time for it to be received by MarAd on or before October 18, 2013.

Position Information

Nine (9) positions will be filled. Individuals with experience in one or more of the following sectors of the marine transportation industry are encouraged to apply:

- Ports and Terminal Operators.
- Shippers.
- Vessel Operators.
- Non-Marine Transportation Providers.
- Metropolitan Planning Organizations and State DOTs.
- Shipbuilders.
- Labor and Workforce Development.
- Academia.

Prohibitions

Registered lobbyists are not eligible to serve on federal advisory committees. Registered lobbyists are lobbyists required to comply with provisions contained in the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Public Law 110–81, as amended).

Period or Service and Expense Reimbursement

Each MTSNAC member serves for a term of two years. Members may serve consecutive terms. All members serve at their own expense and receive no salary. While attending meetings or when otherwise engaged in committee business, members will be reimbursed for travel and per diem expenses as permitted under applicable Federal Travel Regulations.

Authority: 5 U.S.C. app. 2; 41 CFR parts 101–6 and 102–3; DOT Order 1120.3B.

By Order of the Maritime Administrator:

Julie Agarwal, Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 2013–22680 Filed 9–17–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

[Docket No. PHMSA–2013–0137]

Pipeline Safety: Information Collection Activities

AGENCY: Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), 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 Request (ICR) abstracted below is being forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval. A Federal Register Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on the following information collection was published on June 14, 2013, (78 FR 36016). PHMSA received one comment in response to that notice. PHMSA is publishing this notice to respond to the comment, provide the public with an additional 30 days to comment, and announce that the revised Information Collection will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for approval.

ADDRESSES: Send comments regarding the burden estimate, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to OMB, Attention: Desk Officer for PHMSA, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before October 18, 2013.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 1320.8(d), Title 5, Code of Federal Regulations requires PHMSA to provide interested members of the public and affected agencies an opportunity to comment on information collection and recordkeeping requests. This notice identifies an information collection request that PHMSA will be submitting to OMB for renewal and extension. This information collection is contained in the pipeline safety regulations at 49 CFR Parts 190–199.

Summary of Topic Comments/Responses

During the two-month response period for the information collection renewal, PHMSA received one comment from the Pipeline Safety Trust (PST). This 30-day notice responds to the comments, which may be found at http://www.regulations.gov, at docket number PHMSA–2013–0137. The following is a summary of the comment received:

Comment: The Pipeline Safety Trust (PST) believes that improvements are needed to the data collected by the NPMS. They point out, “The accuracy of the data is not high enough to adequately assist local communities who are planning or preparing for potential emergencies;” and suggest that PHMSA require, rather than suggest, NPMS data submissions be made annually. The PST also requests that PHMSA require data on pipelines that are in High Consequence Areas (HCAs) to be submitted at a greater degree of accuracy and recommends that PHMSA