

Public Agency: Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority, Burbank, California.

Application Number: 98-03-C-00-BUR.

Application Type: Impose and use a PFC.

PFC Level: \$3.00.

Total PFC Revenue Approved in This Decision: \$84,481,000.

Earliest Charge Effective Date:

October 1, 2001.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: June 1, 2010.

Class of Air Carriers not Required to Collect PFC's: On-demand air taxi/commercial operators filing FAA Form 1800-31 that (1) do not enplane or deplane passengers at the main passenger terminal building and (2) [collectively] enplane less than 29,000 passengers per year at Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport (BUR).

Determination: Approved. Based on information submitted in the public agency's application, the FAA has determined that the proposed class accounts for less than 1 percent of the total annual enplanements at BUR.

Brief Description of Project Approved for Collection and Use: Replacement terminal.

Decision Date: December 30, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Milligan, Western Pacific Region Airports Division, (310) 725-3621.

Public Agency: City of Eugene, Oregon.

Application Number: 98-03-C-00-EUG.

Application Type: Impose and use a PFC.

PFC Level: \$3.00.

Total PFC Revenue Approved in This Decision: \$805,335.

Earliest Charge Effective Date: March 1, 1999.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: February 1, 2000.

Classes of Air Carriers not Required to Collect PFC's: (1) Operations by air taxi/commercial operators utilizing aircraft having a maximum seating capacity of less than 20 passengers when enplaning revenue passengers in a limited, irregular/non-scheduled, or special service manner; and (2) operations by air taxi/commercial operators, without regard to seating capacity, for revenue passengers transported for student instruction, non-stop sightseeing flights that begin and end at Eugene Airport, Mahlon Sweet Field (EUG) and are

conducted within a 25-mile radius of EUG, firefighting charters, ferry or training flights, air ambulance/medivac flights, and aerial photography or survey flights.

Determination: Approved. Based on information contained in the public agency's application, the FAA has determined that the proposed classes each account for less than 1 percent of the total annual enplanements at EUG.

Brief Description of Projects Approved for Collection and Use:

General aviation ramp reconstruction. Taxiway Alpha and taxiway Alpha 8 reconstruction.

B gate ramp rehabilitation.

Water loop extension.

A gate, north and south canopies.

B gates covered walkways.

Taxiway Alpha 7 reconstruction.

Taxiway Alpha 3 rehabilitation.

Taxiway Alpha rehabilitation.

Taxiway Delta rehabilitation.

Decision Date: December 30, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Vargas, Seattle Airports District Office, (425) 227-2660.

AMENDMENTS TO PFC APPROVALS

Amendment No. city, state	Amendment approved date	Original approved net PFC revenue	Amended approved net PFC revenue	Original estimated charge exp. date	Amended estimated charge exp. date
93-01-C-01-LBB Lubbock, TX	03/18/97	\$10,699,749	\$11,187,305	02/01/00	04/01/00
92-01-I-03-TLH Tallahassee, FL	06/11/98	6,715,081	7,567,709	06/01/98	07/01/98
93-02-U-01-TLH Tallahassee, FL	06/11/98	6,715,081	7,567,709	06/01/98	07/01/98
96-02-C-01-TYS Knoxville, TN	08/25/98	530,000	552,931	05/01/97	05/01/97
94-01-C-02-DUJ DuBois, PA	11/17/98	298,533	264,625	03/01/98	03/01/98
95-01-C-01-MCI Kansas City, MO	11/27/98	64,043,000	92,632,458	05/01/01	01/01/02
98-06-C-01-PHL Philadelphia, PA	12/22/98	26,150,000	26,150,000	01/01/99	01/01/99
98-02-C-01-PWM Portland, ME	12/30/98	6,887,241	8,485,479	10/01/02	02/01/04

Issued in Washington, DC on January 7, 1999.

Eric Gabler,

Manager, Passenger Facility Charge Branch.

[FR Doc. 99-731 Filed 1-12-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Federal Transit Administration

Major Investment Study/Environmental Impact Statement: Northeast Corridor in Indianapolis, Indiana; Hamilton and Marion Counties

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) are jointly issuing this notice to advise the public that a Major Investment Study (MIS)/ Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is being prepared for proposed transportation improvements in the Northeast Corridor of the Indianapolis region. The MIS, which is currently underway, will be used as input to the EIS.

DATES: A public scoping and information meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 26, 1999 from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. with a presentation at 5:30 p.m. in Indianapolis. Written comments on the scope of the alternatives and impacts to be

considered should be sent by March 15, 1999.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Indiana Government Center South Conference Center, Room A, located at 100 North Senate Avenue, in downtown Indianapolis. Written comments on the scope of the alternatives and impacts to be considered should be sent to:

Steve Cecil, Chief, Pre-Engineering and Environment Division at the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT), 100 North Senate Avenue, Indiana Government Center North, Room N848, Indianapolis, IN 46204, scecil@indot.state.in.us;

or, Lori Miser, Transportation Planning Manager, 200 East Washington Street, Suite 1841, Indianapolis, IN 46204, lmiser@indygov.org.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Joel P. Ettinger, FTA Region 5, 200 West Adams St, Suite 2410, Chicago, IL 60606; Telephone: (312) 353-2789. Ms. Joyce Newland, FHWA—Indiana Division, 575 N. Pennsylvania Street, Room 254, Indianapolis, IN 46204, Telephone: (317) 226-5353.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA and FTA, in cooperation with the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) and the Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), will prepare a MS and a Draft EIS (DEIS) for transportation improvements in the Northeast Corridor of the Indianapolis region. The MIS/DEIS is being prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, and implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR parts 1500-1508) and in accordance to FHWA/FTA's planning and environmental impact procedures and regulations (23 CFR 450 and 23 CFR 771).

A major investment study in the Northeast Corridor is underway to consider a range of alternative investment strategies for transportation improvements that will include: Transportation System Management (TSM) and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) facilities, public transit improvements including bus system enhancements, commuter rail, light rail, and other transit technologies, roadway and freeway improvements, as well as a No-Action Alternative. (No-Action Alternative includes existing and committed elements of the region's transportation plan, except for the proposed new start or investment.) Alternatives generated through the scoping process will also be considered. Scoping will be accomplished through written correspondence with interested persons, organizations, and federal, state, and local agencies as well as through the public meeting listed in **DATES** and **ADDRESSES**.

Scoping

FHWA, FTA, INDOT, and the MPO invite all interested individuals, organizations, and federal, state, and local agencies to participate in the scoping process defining the alternatives to be evaluated in the MIS/DEIS and identifying any significant social, economic, or environmental issues related to the alternatives. An information packet describing the purpose and need of the project, the proposed alternatives, the impact areas to be evaluated, the citizen involvement

program, and the preliminary project schedule will be mailed to affected federal, state, and local agencies and will be provided upon request to interested parties on record. Requests for the scoping materials should be directed to Ms. Lori Miser at the address above or by calling her at (317) 327-5136. Scoping comments may be made verbally at the public scoping meeting, or in writing. See the **DATES** and **ADDRESSES** sections above for the location and time. During the scoping phase, comments should focus on identifying specific social, economic, or environmental impacts to be evaluated and suggesting less costly or less environmentally damaging alternatives that achieve similar objectives. However, scoping is not the appropriate time to indicate a preference for a particular alternative. Comments on preferences should be communicated after the MIS/DEIS has been completed. If you wish to be placed on the mailing list to receive further information as the project develops, contact Lori Miser as previously described.

Description of Study Area and Project Needs

The Northeast Corridor is a major travel corridor that stretches from Noblesville in the northeast to just south of the Indianapolis Central Business District (CBD). Major highway facilities in the corridor include I-69 south and west of 126th Street, I-465 from just west of the US 31 interchange to the I-70 interchange, and I-70 from the east leg of I-465 to the CBD. In addition, the study area includes SR 37/Fall Creek Parkway from just north of Noblesville to the CBD, US 31 from north of Carmel to the CBD, and Allisonville Road, Keystone Avenue, and the Meridian Street corridor.

Alternatives

Transportation alternatives to be considered within the corridor include new and/or improved bus services, busways (facilities exclusively for buses), light rail, commuter rail, TSM/TDM/ITS strategies and roadway and highway expansion.

Probable Effects/Potential Impacts for Analysis

FHWA, FTA, INDOT, and the MPO plan to evaluate in the MIS/DEIS all significant social, economic, and environmental impacts of the alternatives. Among the primary issues are transportation service changes, including transit cost, service, patronage change, and its financial implications as well as the effect on traffic movement and railroad operations. Other key

issues include community impacts, including land use planning and zoning compatibility, neighborhood compatibility, local and regional economic change, aesthetics, and utility relocation; cultural resource impacts, including effects on historic, archaeological, and park resources; and natural resource impacts, including air quality, noise and vibration, removal of pre-existing hazardous wastes, water resources, natural features, and ecosystems. The proposed impact assessment and its evaluation criteria will take into account both positive and negative impacts, direct and indirect impacts, short-term (construction) and long-term (operation) impacts, and site-specific and corridor-wide impacts. Evaluation criteria will be consistent with the applicable Federal, State of Indiana, and local standards, criteria, regulations, and policies. Mitigation measures will be explored for any adverse impacts that are identified as part of the analyses.

Procedures

In accordance with the regulations and guidance established by CEQ, as well as with 23 CFR part 450 and 23 CFR part 771 of the FHWA/FTA planning and environmental regulations and policies, the MIS/DEIS will include an evaluation of the social, economic, and environmental impacts of the alternatives. The MIS/DEIS will also comply with the requirements of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (CAAA) and with the Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice. After its publication, the MIS/DEIS will be available for public and agency review and comment, and a public hearing will be held. On the basis of the MIS/DEIS and the comments received, INDOT and the MPO will select a locally preferred alternative for a major investment strategy. The locally preferred alternative will then be reaffirmed by the MPO for inclusion into the Indianapolis Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The MIS shall lead to specification of the project's mode, the design concept and scope in sufficient detail to meet the requirements of the US Environmental Protection Agency's transportation conformity regulations [40 CFR part 93 and 23 CFR 450.322(b)(8)]. INDOT and the MPO will then seek approval from FHWA and FTA to continue with Preliminary Engineering and the preparation of the Final EIS.

Issued on: January 6, 1999.

Lawrence D. Tucker,

*Planning and Program Development
Manager, Federal Highway Administration,
Indianapolis, Indiana.*

Joel P. Ettinger,

*Region 5 Administrator, Federal Transit
Administration, Chicago, Illinois.*

[FR Doc. 99-725 Filed 1-12-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

Amtrak Reform Council; Notice of Meeting

AGENCY: Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of Amtrak Reform Council meeting.

SUMMARY: As provided in Section 203 of the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) gives notice of a meeting of the Amtrak Reform Council ("ARC"). The purpose of the meeting is to receive Amtrak's response to the Department of Transportation's Inspector General's independent assessment report of Amtrak's financial needs, discuss possible selection of an executive director, receive a briefing from representatives of rail labor and to take up such other matters as the Council or its members deem appropriate.

DATES: The meeting is scheduled from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 19, 1999.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held in the Kriebler Center, Free Congress Foundation, 717 Second Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. The meeting is open to the public on a first-come, first-served basis. Portions of the meeting may be closed to the public at the discretion of the Council if proprietary information is to be discussed. Persons in need of special arrangements should contact the person whose name is listed below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alexander Chavrid, Passengers Programs Division, Office of Railroad Development, FRA, RDV-13, Mail Stop 20, 1120 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20590 (mailing address only) or by telephone at (202) 493-6380.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The ARC was created by the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997 (ARAA) as an independent commission to evaluate Amtrak's performance and make recommendations to Amtrak for achieving further cost containment and

productivity improvements, and financial reforms. In addition, the ARAA requires: that the ARC monitor cost savings resulting from work rules established under new agreements between Amtrak and its labor unions; that the ARC provide an annual report to Congress that includes an assessment of Amtrak's progress on the resolution of productivity issues; and that after two years the ARC begin to make findings on whether Amtrak can meet certain financial goals and, if not, to notify the President and the Congress.

The ARAA provides that the ARC consist of eleven members, including the Secretary of Transportation and ten others nominated by the President or Congressional leaders. Each member is to serve a 5 year term.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on January 7, 1999.

Mark E. Yachmetz,

Chief, Passenger Programs Division.

[FR Doc. 99-699 Filed 1-12-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-98-4453; Notice 2]

Dorsey Trailers, Inc., Grant of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Dorsey Trailers, Inc. (Dorsey), a manufacturer of trailers, is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware with headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia and manufacturing facilities in Elba, Alabama; Cartersville, Georgia; and Dillon, South Carolina. Dorsey has determined that its tire and rim label information, on some units, was not in full compliance with 49 CFR 571.120, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 120, "Tire Selection and Rims for Vehicles Other Than Passenger Cars," and has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports." Dorsey has also applied to be exempted from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301—"Motor Vehicle Safety" on the basis that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

Notice of receipt of the application was published, with a 30-day comment period, on October 2, 1998, in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 53123). NHTSA received two comments on this application during the 30-day comment period. Both commenters recommended that NHTSA grant the application.

Paragraph S5.3 of FMVSS No. 120 states that each vehicle shall show the information specified on the tire information label in both English and metric units. The standard also shows an example of the prescribed format.

After the requirement went into effect on March 14, 1996, Dorsey manufactured and/or distributed 18,816 trailers that do not meet the requirements stated in the standard. Of these 18,816 units, 16,788 were produced in Elba between March 14, 1996 and August 27, 1998; 1,713 units were produced in Cartersville between March 14, 1996 and October 31, 1997; and 315 were produced in Dillon between July 1, 1996 and December 9, 1997. The certification label affixed to Dorsey's trailers pursuant to Part 567 failed to comply with S5.3 of FMVSS No. 120 because of the omission of metric measurements, and Dorsey did not separately provide the metric measurements on another label, an alternative allowed by FMVSS No. 120. The use of metric measurements is required by FMVSS No. 120, pursuant to Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards: Metric Conversion, 60 FR 13639, published on March 14, 1995, and effective on March 14, 1996.

Dorsey supports its application for inconsequential noncompliance with the following statements:

1. The certification label contains the correct English unit information and has headings for the required metric data with voids in the area of the required data;

2. The omission of the metric data from Dorsey's 49 CFR 571.120 and 49 CFR 567 certification label is highly unlikely to have any effect whatsoever on motor vehicle safety since the correct English units are included on the label and since the nonconforming vehicles will probably be out of service before the American general public ceases to be familiar with the English system of measurement;

3. The metric requirements of 49 CFR 571.120 S5.3 were not mandated for safety reasons and, the second regulation governing certification label data, 49 CFR 567, has not yet been changed to require that metric data be shown and still states that GVWR and GAWR data be stated in pounds;

4. Each Dorsey manufacturing facility has now begun to provide all the required data on certification labels since appropriate people at each location have been made aware of the requirement; and

5. Dorsey has not received any complaints from customers on the omission of the metric data from the certification labels and has not received