

101-508) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 158).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 9, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Mr. Oscar Sanchez, Project Manager, Harrisburg Airports District Office, 3911 Hartzdale Dr., suite 1100, Camp Hill, PA 17011.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. David G. Holdsworth, Executive Director for the Susquehanna Area Regional Airport Authority at the following address: 135 York Drive, Suite 100, Middletown, PA 17057-5078.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the Susquehanna Area Regional Airport Authority under section 158.23 of Part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Oscar Sanchez, Project Manager, Harrisburg Airports District Office, 3911 Hartzdale Dr., Suite 1100, Camp Hill, PA 17011. 717-730-2834. The application may be reviewed in person at this same location.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose a PFC at Harrisburg International Airport and use the revenue from a PFC at Harrisburg International Airport and Capital City Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Pub. L. 101-508) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

On February 19, 1999, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by the Susquehanna Area Regional Airport Authority was substantially complete within the requirements of section 158.25 of Part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than June 1, 1999.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

Application number: 99-02-C-00-MDT.

Level of the proposed PFC: \$3.00.

Proposed charge effective date: July 1, 1999.

Proposed charge expiration date: August 1, 2000.

Total estimated PFC revenue: \$2,141,249.

Brief description of proposed projects:

- Deicing System Database/Permits
- Loading Bridge Replacements (4)

- Deicing System Design Studies
- Revolving Security Door Replacement
- Taxiway Guidance Signs
- Trackless Plow/Mower
- Equipment Storage Building
- Runway Overlay, Phase 1
- Deicing Truck/Tank
- Dozer/Spreader
- ARFF Titan 4X4 Vehicle
- ARFF 6X6 Vehicle
- Master Plan
- Multi-User Flight Information Display System
- Runway Overlay, Phase 2
- Commuter Concourse Expansion
- PFC Application Development

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: Non-scheduled On-Demand Air Carriers.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** and at the FAA regional Airports office located at: Fitzgerald Federal Building #111, John F. Kennedy International Airport, Jamaica, New York 11430.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Susquehanna Area Regional Airport Authority.

Issued in Jamaica, New York on February 26, 1999.

Kenneth Kroll,

AIP/PFC Team Leader, Planning and Programming Branch, Airports Division, Eastern Region.

[FR Doc. 99-5928 Filed 3-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement; Douglas County, Kansas

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that we are reopening the preparation of a supplemental document to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for a segment of the South Lawrence Trafficway project in Douglas County, Kansas.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David R. Geiger, P.E., FHWA Kansas Division Administrator; Telephone: (785) 267-7287, FHWA—Kansas Division Office, 3300 South Topeka

Boulevard, Suite 1, Topeka, Kansas 66611-2237.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Access

An electronic copy of this document may be downloaded using a modem and suitable communications software from the Government Printing Office's Electronic Bulletin Board Service at (202) 512-1661. Internet users may reach the **Federal Register's** home page at: <http://www.nara.gov/fedreg> and the Government Printing Office's database at: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara>.

Background

The FHWA, in cooperation with the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) and Douglas County, will recommence preparation of a final supplement to the FEIS for a segment of the highway project known as the South Lawrence Trafficway (SLT). The original FEIS for the improvements (FHWA-KS-EIS-87-01-F) was approved on January 4, 1990, and the Record of Decision was approved on June 5, 1990. The project would be primarily on a new location and developed initially as a two lane road. The SLT Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) corridor begins at U.S. 59 and extends east to K-10 on the south side of Lawrence. The western section of the SLT from the I-70/Kansas Turnpike Authority (KTA) interchange near Lecompton, south and east to U.S. 59, has been constructed and was opened to traffic in late 1996 (See 59 FR 52360, October 17, 1994).

The SLT is intended to provide for traffic demands and to alleviate congestion on two primary arterial streets in the south and west sections of the City of Lawrence, and to improve access to the University of Kansas and Clinton Lake.

The FHWA circulated a draft supplemental EIS on October 2, 1995, to address concerns regarding new information on the effect of the SLT on cultural issues, spiritual sites, academic programs and future development at Haskell Indian Nations University (HINU) which was not previously evaluated in the FEIS. A public hearing was held on November 8, 1995. Numerous comments were received on the Draft SEIS from both the public and governmental agencies. Work to develop the Final SEIS was initiated, but was delayed when consensus could not be reached on a preferred alignment.

On February 27, 1997 (See 62 FR 10305, March 6, 1997), the FHWA withdrew as the lead Federal agency due to KDOT and Douglas County deciding not to use Federal-aid funds

for the project. Subsequent legal action resulted in a determination that the SEIS must be completed before the project could proceed. Since the approval date for the Draft SEIS was over three years old, the FHWA completed a reevaluation of the Draft document and found that it remains valid. Therefore, the FHWA will reinstate the process to complete the Supplemental Environmental document process.

The FHWA has determined that a formal scoping meeting is not necessary.

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

David R. Geiger,

*P.E., Division Administrator, Kansas Division,
Federal Highway Administration, Topeka,
Kansas.*

[FR Doc. 99-5940 Filed 3-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-P

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 or Council"). The purpose of the meeting is to receive a briefing from the executive director, continue Amtrak's response to the Department of Transportation's Inspector General's independent assessment report of Amtrak's financial needs, discuss the Council's work program and schedule for the coming year and to take up such other matters as the Council or its members deem appropriate.

DATES: The meeting is scheduled from 1:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. on Monday, March 15, 1999.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held in room 9210 at the U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., 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: Tom Till, Executive Director, Amtrak Reform

Council, JM-ARC, Room 7105, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590 or by telephone at (202) 366-0591.

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 March 3, 1999.

Mark E. Yachmetz,

Chief, Passenger Programs Division.

[FR Doc. 99-5929 Filed 3-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-99-5200; Notice 1]

Capacity of Texas, Inc.; Application for Temporary Exemption From Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 105

We are asking your views on the application by Capacity of Texas, Inc., of Longview, Texas ("Capacity"), for a three-year exemption from requirements of Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 105 *Hydraulic and Electric Brake Systems* that are effective March 1, 1999. Capacity has applied on the basis that "compliance would cause substantial economic hardship to a manufacturer that has tried in good faith to comply with the standard." 49 CFR 555.6(a).

We are publishing this notice of receipt of the application in accordance with our regulations on temporary exemptions. This action does not represent any judgment by us about the merits of the application. The

discussion that follows is based on information contained in Capacity's application.

Why Capacity Needs a Temporary Exemption

On and after March 1, 1999, S5.5 of Standard No. 105 requires any motor vehicle with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) greater than 10,000 pounds, except for a vehicle that has a speed attainable in 2 miles of not more than 33 mph, to be equipped with an antilock brake system. Capacity manufactures bus chassis that it provides to World Trans, Inc., of Hutchinson, Kansas, for completion. However, with respect to the buses that will be covered by the exemption, if granted, Capacity has informed us that, pursuant to the option granted the manufacturer of an incomplete vehicle by 49 CFR 568.7(a), it will assume the responsibilities of the final-stage manufacturer (World Trans), certifying that the completed buses comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards, and provide notification and remedy if required. In the meantime, the usual commercial relationship between Capacity and World Trans need not be interrupted; World Trans, as a final-stage manufacturer, may complete the bus in such a manner that it conforms to the standards in effect on the date that the incomplete vehicle was manufactured. Therefore, buses whose manufacture is completed on or after March 1, 1999, are not required to comply with antilock requirements if their chassis was manufactured before March 1, 1999 (see 49 CFR 568.6(a)).

Why Compliance Would Cause Capacity Substantial Economic Hardship

Capacity produces a limited quantity (100 or less yearly) bus chassis for World Trans, and, as discussed more fully below, has been unable to find a vendor who is willing to provide antilock controllers. Therefore, if Capacity is not granted an exemption, it will have to withdraw the chassis from production, and World Trans's bus production will be diminished. This will cause both Capacity and World Trans to lose income in each of the three years for which exemption has been requested. Capacity's projected net income for its fiscal year ending October 31, 1998, was \$2,631,018. Its projected net income for the year ending October 31, 1999, is \$2,286,617 if an exemption is granted, and \$1,945,087 if it is not. Thus, net income would be reduced by \$341,530 in the absence of an exemption covering production from March 1-October 31, 1999.