

be mailed or delivered to Mr. Ralph L. Hensel, Airport Manager: Clinton County Airport, 11 Airport Road, Suite 101, Plattsburgh, New York 12901.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the County of Clinton under section 158.23 of Part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Robert Levine, Airport Engineer, New York Airports District Office, 600 Old Country Road, Suite 446, Garden City, New York, (516) 227-3807. 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/use the revenue from a PFC at Clinton County Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Public Law 101-508) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 158).

On May 12, 1999, the FAA determined that the application to impose/use the revenue from a PFC submitted by the County of Clinton 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 August 10, 1999.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

PFC Application No.: 99-03-C-00-PLB.

Level of the proposed PFC: \$3.00

Proposed charge effective date: July 1, 1999

Proposed charge expiration date: May 1, 2001

Total estimated PFC revenue: \$63,764

Brief description of proposed project(s):

- Obstruction Evaluation & Aerial Mapping
- Airport Master Plan Update
- Off Airport Obstruction Removal (Phase I)
- Easement Acquisition
- Off Airport Obstruction Removal (Phase II)
- Terminal Expansion & Renovations

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: Air taxi and charter operators (ATCO) filing DOT Form 1800-31.

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,

Airports Division, AEA-610, 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 County of Clinton.

Issued in Garden City, New York on May 17, 1999.

Philip Brito,

Manager, New York Airports District Office, Eastern Region.

[FR Doc. 99-13642 Filed 5-27-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: Clear Creek County, Colorado

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent and public scoping meetings.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an Environmental Impact Statement will be prepared for the proposed transportation project for transportation improvements and alternatives analysis of Interstate 70 (I-70) from Empire Junction to the top of Floyd Hill at the Highland Hills Interchange in Clear Creek County, Colorado.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Scott Sands, FHWA Colorado Division, 555 Zang Street, Room 250, Denver, CO 80228, Telephone: 303/969-6730, extension 362.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to Title 23, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 771, Environmental Impact and Related Procedures (40 CFR 1501.7), the FHWA, in cooperation with the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for proposed transportation improvements and alternatives analysis of I-70 from Empire Junction to the top of Floyd Hill in Clear Creek County, Colorado. The proposed improvement would involve the reconstruction of all or parts of the existing I-70 corridor (as described above) for a distance of approximately sixteen miles. The EIS will evaluate the No-Action and Build alternatives(s) on this I-70 corridor and determine the estimated costs and potential impacts associated with each.

A Major Investment Study (MIS) was performed by CDOT in 1998 to evaluate solutions for the mobility and

congestion problems in the I-70 corridor from the interchange of I-70 and C-470 in Jefferson County, Colorado, west bound to Glenwood Springs, Colorado. The MIS recommended a vision incorporating futuristic thinking over a fifty-year planning horizon. In order to minimize highway improvements, the vision emphasizes changing travel behavior and preservation of the environmental character of the corridor. This EIS is a direct result of the recommendations detailed in the MIS.

The proposed improvements resulting from the MIS are considered necessary to provide for increased safety, existing traffic demand, and projected future travel demand. Alternatives which may be evaluated include: (1) improved four lane roadway typical sections, (2) standard six lane roadway section, (3) non-standard six lane roadway section, (4) Twin Tunnel (MP 242) modifications, (5) interchange improvements, (6) an envelope for the preservation of Fixed Guideway Transit (FGT) system, (7) intermodal transfer center(s), (8) Transportation System Management (TSM) measures, (9) curve smoothing to increase the interstate design geometrics, and (10) No-Action.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, written comments, suggestions or questions should be directed to the FHWA at the address provided above or directed to: Ms. Cecelia Joy, Planning and Environmental Manager, Colorado Department of Transportation-Region 1, 18500 East Colfax Avenue, Aurora, Colorado 80011, Telephone: 303/757-9112.

All significant social, economic, and environmental impacts of the proposed alternatives carried through the EIS process will be evaluated. Depending upon the alternatives under study, impacts to be evaluated may include safety and mobility, visual, social, historic, cultural and archaeological resources, local economy, Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) issues, noise, wetlands, threatened and endangered wildlife species, animal migration, water resources, floodplains, hydrology, geology, air quality, and potential contaminant sources (hazardous wastes). Depending upon the preferred alternative and the associated impacts of that alternative, construction-related impacts and secondary and cumulative impacts may also be evaluated. Subsequently, mitigation of any significant adverse impacts would be developed in the EIS for that alternative.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Draft EIS will be prepared with required engineering design and environmental studies. These studies are necessary to propose a preferred alternative and to complete the document. After its publication, the Draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comments, and a public hearing will be held. On the basis of the Draft EIS and the comments received, a preferred alternative will be selected and preparation of the Final EIS and Record of Decision will proceed.

FHWA, CDOT and other local agencies invite interested individuals, organizations, and federal, state and local agencies to participate in defining the alternatives to be evaluated in the EIS and identifying any significant social, economic, or environmental issues related to the proposed alternatives. Information describing the purpose of the project, the proposed alternatives, the areas to be evaluated, the citizen involvement program, and the preliminary project schedule will be available. These scoping materials may be requested by contacting Ms. Cecelia Joy at the address and phone number above. Scoping comments may be made verbally or in writing to Ms. Joy and at future public meetings. Refinements to scoping will continue through coordination with affected parties, organizations, federal, state and local agencies and one-on-one meetings.

Information describing the status of the project and 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 an interest in this proposal.

The public will receive notices on location and time of future meetings and public hearings through newspaper advertisements and other means.

To ensure that a full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues are identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. If you wish to be placed on the mailing list to receive further information as the project develops, contact Ms. Cecelia Joy at the address above.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Research, Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation of Federal programs and activities apply to this program)

Issued on: May 18, 1999.

Ronald A. Sperl,

Environmental/ROW Manager, Colorado Division, Federal Highway Administration, Lakewood, Colorado.

[FR Doc. 99-13610 Filed 5-27-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-99-5014; notice 2]

Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc.; Grant of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc. (Bridgestone) determined that certain tires manufactured in 1998 of various sizes and brands are not in full compliance with 49 CFR 571.119, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 119, "New pneumatic tires for vehicles other than passenger cars," and has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports." Bridgestone 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.

Although the applicant stated this was a noncompliance with FMVSS No. 119, NHTSA considers this to be a noncompliance with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 109, New pneumatic tires. On March 2, 1999, the agency received a letter from Bridgestone concurring that the relevant standard is indeed FMVSS No. 109.

Notice of receipt of the application was published, with a 30-day comment period, on February 15, 1999, in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 6937). NHTSA received no comments on this application during the 30-day comment period.

Paragraph S4.3.2 of FMVSS No. 109 requires each tire to be marked in accordance with Part 574, Tire Identification and Recordkeeping. If a tire lacks this correct information, it fails to comply with FMVSS No. 109 and is subject to the notification and remedy requirements of Chapter 301, unless exempted pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) on grounds of inconsequentiality.

On December 12, 1998, Bridgestone produced approximately 1,389 tires with an incorrect date code. The affected tires were marked incorrectly with a date code of "509," instead of the correct date code of "508." The tires

were manufactured at Bridgestone's Oklahoma City Plant.

Bridgestone supports its application for inconsequential noncompliance by stating that all of the tires manufactured in the affected sizes and brands meet all the agency's requirements, except the correct date code. The purpose of the date code is to identify a tire so that, if necessary, the appropriate action can be taken in the interest of public safety—such as, a safety recall notice.

The agency believes that in the case of a tire labeling noncompliance, the true measure of its inconsequentiality to motor vehicle safety is whether the mislabeling would affect the manufacturer's ability to locate them, if the tires were to be recalled for a performance-related noncompliance. Bridgestone has stated that it will include the 509 code in any future recall of tires manufactured in its Oklahoma City plant during the 50th week of 1998. In addition, the tires meet all of the agency's safety performance requirements.

In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that the applicant has met its burden of persuasion that the noncompliance it describes is inconsequential to safety. Accordingly, its application is granted, and the applicant is exempted from providing the notification of the noncompliance that is required by 49 U.S.C. 30118, and from remedying the noncompliance, as required by 49 U.S.C. 30120.

(49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8)

Issued on: May 25, 1999.

L. Robert Shelton,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 99-13645 Filed 5-27-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Research and Special Programs Administration

[Docket No. RSPA-99-5143 (Notice No. 99-7)]

Hazardous Materials Transportation Advisory; Year 2000 (Y2K) Conversion

AGENCY: Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA), DOT.

ACTION: Year 2000 (Y2K) enforcement policy advisory notice.

SUMMARY: Because many elements of the nation's transportation system rely on computers, computerized equipment, and electronic databases, the year 2000 may see potential problems and disruptions that could have an adverse