

questions and the seven responses available for public view and comment are included in Attachment 15 of the sponsor's application for public review.

The FAA has determined that the application is substantially complete. As part of its review of the SWF final application, the FAA will consider all comments and information submitted by interested parties during the 60-day comment period for this notice.

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 2, 1999.

David L. Bennett,

Director, Airport Safety and Standards.

[FR Doc. 99-8752 Filed 4-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Satellite Operational Implementation Team (SOIT) Hosted Forum on the Capabilities of the Global Positioning System (GPS)/Wide Area Augmentation System (WAAS) and Local Area Augmentation System (LAAS)

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

NAME: FAA SOIT Forum on GPS/WAAS/LAAS Capabilities.

TIME AND DATE: 9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m., May 17-18, 1999.

PLACE: The Holiday Inn Fair Oaks Hotel, 11787 Lee Jackson Memorial Highway, Fairfax, Virginia 22033.

STATUS: Open to the aviation industry with attendance limited to space available.

PURPOSE: The FAA SOIT will be hosting a public forum to discuss the FAA's GPS approvals and WAAS/LAAS operational implementation plans. This meeting will be held in conjunction with a regularly scheduled meeting of the FAA SOIT and in response to aviation industry requests to the FAA Administrator. Formal presentations by the FAA will be followed by a question and answer session. Those planning to attend are invited to submit proposed discussion topics.

REGISTRATION: Participants are requested to register their intent to attend this meeting by May 3, 1999. Names, affiliations, telephone and facsimile numbers should be sent to the point of contact listed below.

POINT OF CONTACT: Registration and submission of suggested discussion topics may be made to Mr. Steven

Albers, phone (202) 267-7301, fax (202) 267-5086, or email at steven.CTR.albers@faa.gov.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on March 22, 1999.

Hank Cabler,

SOIT Co-Chairman.

[FR Doc. 99-8751 Filed 4-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Intent To Rule on Application 99-03-C-00-ALO To Impose and Use the Revenue From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) at Waterloo Municipal Airport, Waterloo, IA

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent to rule on application.

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC at Waterloo Municipal 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).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 10, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Federal Aviation Administration, Central Region, Airports Division, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, MO 64106.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Ms. Kim Bakker, Assistant Director of Aviation, Waterloo Municipal Airport, at the following address: Waterloo Municipal Airport, 2790 Airport Boulevard, Waterloo, Iowa 50703.

Air Carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the City of Waterloo, Waterloo Municipal Airport, under section 158.23 of Part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lorna Sandridge, PFC Program Manager, FAA, Central Region, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, MO 64106, (816) 426-4730. 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

and use the revenue from a PFC at the Waterloo Municipal 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 March 24, 1999, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by the City of Waterloo, Iowa, was substantially complete within the requirements of § 158.25 of Part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than June 23, 1999.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

Level of the proposed PFC: \$3.00.

Proposed charge effective date: September, 1999.

Proposed charge expiration date: February, 2004.

Total estimated PFC revenue: \$763,830.

Brief description of proposed project(s): Rehabilitate East General Aviation Apron; Terminal Building Modernization—Conceptual Plan; Terminal Building Modernization—Architectural Design; Taxiway 'D' Reconstruction; Terminal Building Modernization—Construction.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Waterloo Municipal Airport.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri on March 24, 1999.

George A. Hendon,

Manager, Airports Division, Central Region.

[FR Doc. 99-8750 Filed 4-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Federal Transit Administration

Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century; Implementation Information for the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Deployment Program

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

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This document publishes implementation information on the

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Deployment Program described in sections 5208 and 5209 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), enacted on June 9, 1998. The notice identifies the criteria for the two components of the ITS Deployment Program, namely the ITS Integration Program and the Commercial Vehicle Intelligent Transportation Infrastructure Deployment Program. Implementation information on this program was issued to the FHWA Division and the FTA Regional Offices on January 4, 1999, and is contained in this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For the ITS Integration component of the ITS Deployment Program: Ms. Toni Wilbur, FHWA Office of Travel Management, HOTM, (202) 366-2199; or Mr. Ron Boenau, FTA Office of Mobility Innovation, TRI-11, (202) 366-0195; for the Commercial Vehicle ITS Infrastructure Deployment component of the ITS Deployment Program: Mr. Steve Crane, FHWA Office of Motor Carrier and Highway Safety, HMTE, (202) 366-0950; for legal issues: Mr. Wilbert Baccus, HCC-32, FHWA Office of the Chief Counsel (202) 366-0780; or Linda Sorkin, TCC-24, FTA Office of the Chief Counsel, (202) 366-1936, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC. 20590. FHWA office hours are from 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. FTA office hours are from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

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 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 TEA-21 (Pub. L. 105-178, 112 Stat. 107) implementation material published in this notice is provided for informational purposes only. Specific questions on any of the material published in this notice should be directed to the contact persons named in the caption **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** for this program.

This implementation information applies to ITS projects in areas designated in either the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency

Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Pub. L. 105-277, 112 Stat. 2681) or in section 5208(g) of TEA-21. Although the locations and funding amounts for the ITS Deployment Program have been designated by Congress, specific projects must contribute to the integration and interoperability of intelligent transportation systems, consistent with the criteria set forth in TEA-21.

Section 5208 of TEA-21 establishes the ITS Integration Program to accelerate the integration and interoperability of ITS systems in both metropolitan and rural areas, and provides criteria for the selection of projects that will support this goal. These criteria include the demonstration of a strong commitment to cooperation among agencies, jurisdictions, and the private sector, and a commitment to a comprehensive plan of fully integrated intelligent transportation system deployment in accordance with the national ITS architecture and standards. Public-private partnerships are encouraged, including arrangements that generate revenue to offset public investment costs and minimize the relative percentage and amount of Federal ITS funding. All ITS Integration Program projects must be part of approved plans and programs developed under applicable statewide and metropolitan transportation planning processes and applicable State air quality implementation plans, as appropriate, at the time at which Federal funds are sought. In addition, funding recipients must demonstrate a commitment to the long-term operations, management and maintenance of the system without continued reliance on Federal ITS funding.

The purpose of the Commercial Vehicle Intelligent Transportation Infrastructure Deployment Program, as described in section 5209 of TEA-21, is to improve the safety and productivity of commercial vehicles and drivers, and to reduce the costs associated with commercial vehicle operations and Federal and State commercial vehicle regulatory requirements. TEA-21 establishes criteria for identifying priority areas and encourages multistate cooperation and corridor development to improve the safety of commercial vehicle operations. Activities funded under the Commercial Vehicle Intelligent Transportation Infrastructure Deployment Program should advance the use of technology to increase the efficiency of the regulatory inspection processes, reduce administrative burdens, facilitate commercial vehicle inspections, and generally increase the

effectiveness of enforcement efforts. Funds can also be used to enhance the safe passage of commercial vehicles across the United States and across international borders.

The FHWA and the FTA are publishing this notice to provide information to the public on the activities and/or projects that are eligible for funding under the ITS Deployment Program, the locations and amounts of funding, and how the TEA-21 criteria will be met for the candidate projects to be funded.

(Authority: 23 U.S.C. 315; sec. 5208, Pub. L. 105-178, 112 Stat. 458, (23 U.S.C. 502 nt.); sec. 5209, Pub. L. 105-178, 112 Stat. 460, (23 U.S.C. 502 nt.); 49 CFR 1.48).

Issued on: March 31, 1999.

Kenneth R. Wykle,

Federal Highway Administrator.

Gordon J. Linton,

Federal Transit Administrator.

The text of the FHWA and the FTA implementation guidelines memorandum follows: January 4, 1999 (HTV-3, TOA-2)

ACTION: Notification of Participation in the TEA-21 ITS Deployment Program, FHWA Deputy Administrator, FTA Deputy Administrator, FHWA Division Administrators, FTA Regional Administrators, Motor Carrier State Directors.

This is to notify you that areas within your State or region have been identified to participate in the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Deployment Program based on designations contained in either the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999, or in Section 5208(g)(2) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21).

While the FY 1999 Appropriations Act specifies the locations and amounts of funding, it does not designate specific projects to be funded. Rather, the Conference Report accompanying the FY 1999 Appropriations Act specifies that projects selected for funding "contribute to the integration and interoperability of intelligent transportation systems consistent with the criteria set forth in TEA-21."

The ITS Deployment Program authorized in TEA-21 includes two components. The ITS Integration component of the ITS Deployment Program is described in section 5208 of TEA-21. This program provides Federal ITS funding for the integration of multimodal ITS components in a variety of settings, including large regional or multi-State areas, metropolitan areas, and rural areas. Specific project

selection criteria are included in TEA-21.

The Commercial Vehicle Intelligent Transportation Infrastructure Deployment component of the ITS Deployment Program is described in section 5209 of TEA-21. This program provides Federal ITS funding to support the goal Congress established in TEA-21 to complete deployment of Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN) in a majority of States by September 30, 2003.

Progress towards this goal can only be achieved if those States designated in the FY 99 Appropriations Act use all or some of their funding to advance towards CVISN Level 1 Capabilities in their State.

Because this is a multimodal program, it will require close cooperation among FHWA Federal-aid and Motor Carrier staff, FHWA division offices and resource centers, FTA regional office staff and the appropriate headquarters offices. Areas designated for ITS Deployment Program funding will be required to submit project descriptions specifying the proposed use of these funds and indicating how the TEA-21 criteria will be met. We are finalizing guidance materials to assist you in working with the State and local agencies to implement the ITS Deployment Program. This material will be provided to you in the near future. It should be shared and discussed with the highway and transit officials in the State departments of transportation, and the appropriate local highway, transit, and metropolitan planning organizations as soon as possible after you receive it.

Attached is a list of the areas and the congressionally designated amounts contained in the FY 1999 Appropriations Act. As explained in the attachment, the actual amounts of funding available are less than the amount designated. This is due to the obligation limitation, the fact that the total amount of appropriation and authorization earmarks exceeds the TEA-21 program authorization, and the need to provide funding for national evaluations as specified in TEA-21.

Thank you in advance for your assistance in this important departmental initiative. If you have any questions about the ITS Deployment Program, please call Ms. Toni Wilbur, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), (202) 366-2199; Mr. Ron Boenau, Federal Transit Administration (FTA), (202) 366-0195; or Mr. Steve Crane, FHWA Office of Motor Carrier and Highway Safety, (202) 366-0950.

/s/ signed by:

Nuria I. Fernandez.

/s/ signed by:

Gloria J. Jeff.

Attachment 1

December 23, 1998

FEDERAL HIGHWAY
ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL TRANSIT
ADMINISTRATION

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION
SYSTEMS

FY 1999 FUNDING FOR
CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED
PROJECTS

Congressionally Designated Amounts Versus Amounts Authorized

FY 1999 Congressional designations against the ITS Deployment Program total \$114.8 million; \$9.8 million in TEA-21, and \$105 million in the FY 1999 DOT Appropriation Act (see column 2 of the attached worksheet). However, TEA-21 only authorizes \$105 million for the ITS Deployment Program in FY 1999. Thus, the \$114.8 million in Congressionally designated projects exceeds the FY 1999 available amount of \$105.0 billion by \$9.8 million. To adjust the Congressionally designated amounts downward to the authorized level, each Congressionally designated project was necessarily reduced by approximately 8.5% (see column 3 of the attached worksheet).

Reductions Required by Section 1102(f) of TEA-21

The ITS Program is not only subject to the overall obligation limitation on Federal-aid Highways but is also subject to proportional distribution of that limitation. In FY 1999, each State and/or program subject to the distribution of the FY 1999 Obligation Limitation receives an obligation limitation equal to 88.3% of the amounts "authorized" for FY 1999.

Basically, section 1102(f) states that any amounts for "allocated" programs which cannot be obligated within the distributed obligation limitation will be taken away from these programs and redistributed to the States. Implementation of this section will reduce the ITS Deployment Program from \$105 million to \$92.715 million, a reduction of 11.7%. This mandated 11.7% reduction (\$12.285 million) has been applied proportionately to each Congressionally designated project as reflected in Column 5 of the attached worksheet.

Reductions for Project Evaluations

Section 5204(j) requires the Secretary to issue guidelines and requirements to ensure that independent evaluations will be made on ITS operational tests and deployment projects. This section also directs the establishment of evaluation funding to ensure adequate evaluations are carried out.

For fiscal year 1999, all ITS Deployment Program funding recipients will be required to conduct an evaluation that is locally funded and executed. Cross-cutting assessments of these local evaluations will be conducted by the ITS Joint Program Office and will include gathering data and disseminating results. More details on the scope of local evaluations will be included in the forthcoming ITS Deployment Program guidance materials.

In-depth, independent evaluations of selected projects of national significance (as determined by the ITS Joint Program Office), will also be required. Funding for the evaluations of significant projects will be derived by pooling 2% of each project amount (see Column 7 of the attached worksheet). Please note that projects III and IV on the attached worksheet were funded from the ITS Deployment Program in TEA-21, but are exempt from the evaluation requirement since they are research projects, not ITS operational tests or deployments.

Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN) (See Column 9)

In TEA-21 Congress established a goal to complete deployment of CVISN in a majority of States by September 30, 2003. The FHWA's State CVISN Level 1 deployment strategy consists of three key steps: Planning, Design, and Implementation and Deployment. Our strategy for States to achieve this goal will require the use of all or a portion of 1999 funds to complete at a minimum the next step. The first step, Planning, includes participation in two ITS/CVO training courses and the development of an ITS/CVO State business plan. This step is essential to promote ITS/CVO awareness and coalition building among the State agencies involved in CVO and with industry. This step is estimated to require a minimum of \$50 thousand of Federal ITS Funds. The focus of the second step, Design, is for the State to establish its CVISN project team, including at a minimum a CVISN project manager and a system architect. Once these individuals have been selected, a State can participate in the Understanding ITS/CVO Technology training course and in three CVISN

workshops. These activities will assist the State in developing its CVISN Project Plan and Top-Level Design. This step is estimated to require at least \$350 thousand of Federal ITS Funds. The final step is the Implementation and Deployment of CVISN Level 1 Capabilities. The total amount of Federal ITS Funds for the three steps is \$3 million. This represents the 50% ITS

Federal share of the estimated \$6 to \$10 million total cost, based on CVISN project plans submitted by the participating Pilot States. Column 9 lists the minimum amount of FY 99 funds that are needed to support the completion of the next step for States identified in the Congressional designations. Note, the States of Minnesota, Maryland, and Washington

(in partnership with Oregon) have already received Federal ITS deployment funding prior to FY 99. The minimum amount available for the State of Minnesota is \$2,000,000, for the State of Maryland is \$1,976,673.76, and for the State of Washington is \$1,582,939.02 to complete the third step.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION / FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION—ANALYSIS OF FY 1999 ITS DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM FUNDING

Column 1 Project	Column 2 Congressional Designated Amounts	Column 3 Designations Exceed Authorizations	Column 4 Total Authorized	Column 5 Section 1102(f) Reduction (11.7%)	Column 6 Subtotal	Column 7 Project Evaluation Reduction (2%)	Column 8 Total Available	Column 9 Minimum for CVISN	Column 10 Available for Integration Projects
TEA—21 Earmarks:	\$9,800,000.00	(\$836,585.37)	\$8,963,414.63	(\$1,048,719.51)	\$7,914,695.12	(\$113,067.07)	\$7,801,628.05	\$0.00	\$7,801,628.05
1. Great Lakes ITS Implementation	2,000,000.00	(170,731.71)	1,829,268.29	(214,024.39)	1,615,243.90	(32,304.88)	1,582,939.02	0.00	1,582,939.02
2. Northeast ITS Implementation	5,000,000.00	(426,829.27)	4,573,170.73	(535,060.98)	4,038,109.76	(80,762.20)	3,957,347.56	0.00	3,957,347.56
3. Haz. Mat. Monitoring Systems	1,500,000.00	(128,048.78)	1,371,951.22	(160,518.29)	1,211,432.93	0.00	1,211,432.93	0.00	1,211,432.93
4. Translink—Texas Transp. Inst	1,300,000.00	(110,975.61)	1,189,024.39	(139,115.85)	1,049,908.54	0.00	1,049,908.54	0.00	1,049,908.54
FY 1999 Appropriation Act:	105,000,000.00	(8,963,414.63)	96,036,585.37	(11,236,280.49)	84,800,304.88	(1,696,006.10)	83,104,298.78	9,861,612.80	73,242,685.98
1. Amherst, Massachusetts	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
2. Arlington County, Virginia	750,000.00	(64,024.39)	685,975.61	(80,259.15)	605,716.46	(12,114.33)	593,602.13	0.00	593,602.13
3. Atlanta, Georgia	2,000,000.00	(170,731.71)	1,829,268.29	(214,024.39)	1,615,243.90	(32,304.88)	1,582,939.02	0.00	1,582,939.02
4. Brandon, Vermont	375,000.00	(32,012.20)	342,987.80	(40,129.57)	302,858.23	(6,057.16)	296,801.07	0.00	296,801.07
5. Buffalo, New York	500,000.00	(42,682.93)	457,317.07	(53,506.10)	403,810.98	(8,076.22)	395,734.76	0.00	395,734.76
6. Centre Valley, Pennsylvania	500,000.00	(42,682.93)	457,317.07	(53,506.10)	403,810.98	(8,076.22)	395,734.76	0.00	395,734.76
7. Cleveland, Ohio	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
8. Columbus, Ohio	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
9. Corpus Christi, Texas	900,000.00	(76,829.27)	823,170.73	(96,310.98)	726,859.76	(14,537.20)	712,322.56	0.00	712,322.56
10. Dade County, Florida	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
11. Del Rio, Texas	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
12. Delaware River, Pennsylvania	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
13. Fairfield, California	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
14. Fitchburg, Massachusetts	500,000.00	(42,682.93)	457,317.07	(53,506.10)	403,810.98	(8,076.22)	395,734.76	0.00	395,734.76
15. Greater Metro. Region—DC	5,000,000.00	(426,829.27)	4,573,170.73	(535,060.98)	4,038,109.76	(80,762.20)	3,957,347.56	0.00	3,957,347.56
16. Hammond, Louisiana	4,000,000.00	(341,463.41)	3,658,536.59	(428,048.78)	3,230,487.80	(64,609.76)	3,165,878.05	0.00	3,165,878.05
17. Houston, Texas	2,000,000.00	(170,731.71)	1,829,268.29	(214,024.39)	1,615,243.90	(32,304.88)	1,582,939.02	0.00	1,582,939.02
18. Huntington Beach, California	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
19. Huntsville, Alabama	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
20. Inglewood, California	1,500,000.00	(128,048.78)	1,371,951.22	(160,518.29)	1,211,432.93	(24,228.66)	1,187,204.27	0.00	1,187,204.27
21. Jackson, Mississippi	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
22. Kansas City, Missouri	500,000.00	(42,682.93)	457,317.07	(53,506.10)	403,810.98	(8,076.22)	395,734.76	0.00	395,734.76
23. Laredo, Texas	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
24. Middlesboro, Kentucky	3,000,000.00	(256,097.56)	2,743,902.44	(321,036.59)	2,422,865.85	(48,457.32)	2,374,408.54	0.00	2,374,408.54
25. Mission Viejo, California	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
26. Mobile, Alabama	2,500,000.00	(213,414.63)	2,286,585.37	(267,530.49)	2,019,054.88	(40,381.10)	1,978,673.78	0.00	1,978,673.78
27. Monroe County, New York	400,000.00	(34,146.34)	365,853.66	(42,804.88)	323,048.78	(6,460.98)	316,587.80	0.00	316,587.80
28. Montgomery, Alabama	1,250,000.00	(106,707.32)	1,143,292.68	(133,765.24)	1,009,527.44	(20,190.55)	989,336.89	0.00	989,336.89
29. Nashville, Tennessee	500,000.00	(42,682.93)	457,317.07	(53,506.10)	403,810.98	(8,076.22)	395,734.76	0.00	395,734.76
30. New Orleans, Louisiana	1,500,000.00	(128,048.78)	1,371,951.22	(160,518.29)	1,211,432.93	(24,228.66)	1,187,204.27	0.00	1,187,204.27
31. New York City, New York	2,500,000.00	(213,414.63)	2,286,585.37	(267,530.49)	2,019,054.88	(40,381.10)	1,978,673.78	0.00	1,978,673.78
32. New York/Long Island, NY	2,300,000.00	(196,341.46)	2,103,658.54	(246,128.05)	1,857,530.49	(37,150.61)	1,820,379.88	0.00	1,820,379.88
33. Oakland County, Michigan	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
34. Onondaga County, New York	400,000.00	(34,146.34)	365,853.66	(42,804.88)	323,048.78	(6,460.98)	316,587.80	0.00	316,587.80
35. Port Angeles, Washington	500,000.00	(42,682.93)	457,317.07	(53,506.10)	403,810.98	(8,076.22)	395,734.76	0.00	395,734.76
36. Raleigh-Wake County, NC	2,000,000.00	(170,731.71)	1,829,268.29	(214,024.39)	1,615,243.90	(32,304.88)	1,582,939.02	0.00	1,582,939.02
37. Riverside, California	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
38. San Francisco, California	1,500,000.00	(128,048.78)	1,371,951.22	(160,518.29)	1,211,432.93	(24,228.66)	1,187,204.27	0.00	1,187,204.27
39. Scranton, Pennsylvania	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
40. Silicon Valley, California	1,500,000.00	(128,048.78)	1,371,951.22	(160,518.29)	1,211,432.93	(24,228.66)	1,187,204.27	0.00	1,187,204.27
41. Spokane, Washington	450,000.00	(38,414.63)	411,585.37	(48,155.49)	363,429.88	(7,268.60)	356,161.28	0.00	356,161.28
42. Springfield, Virginia	500,000.00	(42,682.93)	457,317.07	(53,506.10)	403,810.98	(8,076.22)	395,734.76	0.00	395,734.76
43. St. Louis, Missouri	750,000.00	(64,024.39)	685,975.61	(80,259.15)	605,716.46	(12,114.33)	593,602.13	0.00	593,602.13
44. State of Alaska	1,500,000.00	(128,048.78)	1,371,951.22	(160,518.29)	1,211,432.93	(24,228.66)	1,187,204.27	350,000.00	837,204.27
45. State of Idaho	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	350,000.00	441,469.51
46. State of Maryland	2,500,000.00	(213,414.63)	2,286,585.37	(267,530.49)	2,019,054.88	(40,381.10)	1,978,673.78	1,978,673.78	0.00
47. State of Minnesota	7,100,000.00	(606,097.56)	6,493,902.44	(759,786.59)	5,734,115.85	(114,682.32)	5,619,433.54	2,000,000.00	3,619,433.54
48. State of Mississippi	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	350,000.00	441,469.51
49. State of Missouri	500,000.00	(42,682.93)	457,317.07	(53,506.10)	403,810.98	(8,076.22)	395,734.76	350,000.00	45,734.76
50. State of Montana	700,000.00	(59,756.10)	640,243.90	(74,908.54)	565,335.37	(11,306.71)	554,028.66	350,000.00	204,028.66
51. State of Nevada	575,000.00	(49,085.37)	525,914.63	(61,532.01)	464,382.62	(9,287.65)	455,094.97	350,000.00	105,094.97
52. State of New Jersey	3,000,000.00	(256,097.56)	2,743,902.44	(321,036.59)	2,422,865.85	(48,457.32)	2,374,408.54	350,000.00	2,024,408.54
53. State of New Mexico	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	350,000.00	441,469.51
54. State of New York	2,500,000.00	(213,414.63)	2,286,585.37	(267,530.49)	2,019,054.88	(40,381.10)	1,978,673.78	350,000.00	1,628,673.78
55. State of North Dakota	1,450,000.00	(123,780.49)	1,326,219.51	(155,167.68)	1,171,051.83	(23,421.04)	1,147,630.79	50,000.00	1,097,630.79
56. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania	14,000,000.00	(1,195,121.95)	12,804,878.05	(1,498,170.73)	11,306,707.32	(226,134.15)	11,080,573.17	350,000.00	10,730,573.17
57. State of Texas	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	50,000.00	741,469.51
58. State of Utah	3,600,000.00	(307,317.07)	3,292,682.93	(385,243.90)	2,907,439.02	(58,148.78)	2,849,290.24	350,000.00	2,499,290.24
59. State of Washington	2,000,000.00	(170,731.71)	1,829,268.29	(214,024.39)	1,615,243.90	(32,304.88)	1,582,939.02	1,582,939.02	0.00
60. State of Wisconsin	1,500,000.00	(128,048.78)	1,371,951.22	(160,518.29)	1,211,432.93	(24,228.66)	1,187,204.27	350,000.00	837,204.27
61. Temucula, California	250,000.00	(21,341.46)	228,658.54	(26,753.05)	201,905.49	(4,038.11)	197,867.38	0.00	197,867.38
62. Tucson, Arizona	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
63. Volusia County, Florida	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
64. Warren County, Virginia	250,000.00	(21,341.46)	228,658.54	(26,753.05)	201,905.49	(4,038.11)	197,867.38	0.00	197,867.38
65. Wausau-Stevens Point, WI	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
66. Westchester/Putnam Co., NY	500,000.00	(42,682.93)	457,317.07	(53,506.10)	403,810.98	(8,076.22)	395,734.76	0.00	395,734.76
67. White Plains, New York	1,000,000.00	(85,365.85)	914,634.15	(107,012.20)	807,621.95	(16,152.44)	791,469.51	0.00	791,469.51
Project Evaluations	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,809,073.17	1,809,073.17	0.00	1,809,073.17
GRAND TOTAL	\$114,800,000.00	(\$9,800,000.00)	\$105,000,004.00	(\$12,285,000.00)	\$92,715,000.00	\$0.00	\$92,715,000.00	\$9,861,612.80	\$82,853,387.20

[FR Doc. 99-8569 Filed 4-7-99; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 33730]

IMC Global Inc.—Intracorporate Family Transaction Exemption—Trona Railway Company, LLC

IMC Global Inc. (IMC), a noncarrier, has filed a verified notice of exemption. The exempt transaction involves the merger of two IMC subsidiaries: Trona Railway Company, LLC (TR-LLC), currently a noncarrier,¹ and Trona Railway Company (Trona), a Class III railroad.² Trona will be merged into TR-LLC, with TR-LLC being the surviving entity following the merger.

The earliest the transaction could be consummated was March 25, 1999, the effective date of the exemption (7 days after the notice of exemption was filed).

The proposed merger is intended to modify IMC's corporate structure through the merger of Trona and TR-LLC in order to improve the financial viability of the applicants, to permit the merged company to enjoy the benefits afforded to limited liability companies under Delaware law, and to facilitate the recapitalization of certain noncarrier subsidiaries of IMC, including TR-LLC's direct corporate parent, IMC Chemicals Inc.

This is a transaction within a corporate family of the type specifically exempted from prior review and approval under 49 CFR 1180.2(d)(3). The parties state that the transaction will not result in adverse changes in service levels, significant operational changes, or a change in the competitive balance with carriers outside the corporate family.

Under 49 U.S.C. 10502(g), the Board may not use its exemption authority to relieve a rail carrier of its statutory obligation to protect the interests of its employees. Section 11326(c), however, does not provide for labor protection for transactions under sections 11324 and 11325 that involve only Class III rail carriers. Because this transaction involves Class III rail carriers only, the Board, under the statute, may not

impose labor protective conditions for this transaction.

If the verified notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio*. Petitions to reopen the proceeding to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of a petition to reopen will not automatically stay the transaction.

An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to STB Finance Docket No. 33730, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board, Office of the Secretary, Case Control Unit, 1925 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20423-0001. In addition, a copy of each pleading must be served on Donald H. Smith, Esq., Sidley & Austin, 1722 I Street, NW., Washington, DC 20006.

Board decisions and notices are available on our website at "WWW.STB.DOT.GOV."

Decided: March 31, 1999.

By the Board, David M. Konschnik, Director, Office of Proceedings.

Vernon A. Williams,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99-8472 Filed 4-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915-00-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 33729]

Union Pacific Railroad Company—Trackage Rights Exemption—The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company

The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company (BNSF) has agreed to grant overhead trackage rights to Union Pacific Railroad Company (UP) over BNSF's rail line between (1) Rockview Junction, MO, BNSF milepost 141.7 (River Subdivision), and Jonesboro, AR, BNSF milepost 420.0 (Thayer South Subdivision), via Turrell, AR, BNSF milepost 282.3 (River Subdivision) and (2) Rockview Junction, MO, BNSF milepost 141.7 (River Subdivision), and KC Junction, TN, BNSF milepost 486.0 (Thayer South Subdivision), a total distance of approximately 350.4 miles.¹

The transaction is scheduled to be consummated on or shortly after April 1, 1999.

¹ On March 19, 1999, UP filed a petition for exemption in STB Finance Docket No. 33729 (Sub-No. 1), *Union Pacific Railroad Company—Trackage Rights Exemption—The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company*, wherein UP requests that the Board permit the proposed overhead trackage rights arrangement described in the present proceeding to expire on July 31, 1999. That petition will be addressed by the Board in a separate decision.

The purpose of the trackage rights is permit UP to use BNSF trackage when UP's trackage is out of service for maintenance.

As a condition to this exemption, any employees affected by the trackage rights will be protected by the conditions imposed in *Norfolk and Western Ry. Co.—Trackage Rights—BN*, 354 I.C.C. 605 (1978), as modified in *Mendocino Coast Ry., Inc.—Lease and Operate*, 360 I.C.C. 653 (1980).

This notice is filed under 49 CFR 1180.2(d)(7). If it contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio*. Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of a petition to revoke will not automatically stay the transaction.

An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to STB Finance Docket No. 33729, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board, Office of the Secretary, Case Control Unit, 1925 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20423-0001. In addition, one copy of each pleading must be served on Joseph D. Anthofer, Esq., 1416 Dodge Street, #830, Omaha, NE 68179.

Board decisions and notices are available on our website at "WWW.STB.DOT.GOV."

Decided: March 30, 1999.

By the Board, David M. Konschnik, Director, Office of Proceedings.

Vernon A. Williams,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99-8327 Filed 4-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915-00-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

March 29, 1999.

The Department of the Treasury has submitted the following public information collection requirement(s) to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling the Treasury Bureau Clearance Officer listed. Comments regarding this information collection should be addressed to the OMB reviewer listed and to the Treasury Department Clearance Officer, Department of the Treasury, Room 2110, 1425 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20220.

¹ TR-LLC is a newly-formed limited liability company chartered in the State of Delaware.

² TR-LLC and Trona are both indirectly owned and controlled by IMC. Trona operates approximately 30 miles of rail line between Trona, CA, and a connection with the Union Pacific Railroad near Searles, CA. IMC also indirectly owns and controls The Hutchinson & Northern Railway Company, a Class III railroad, which operates 3 miles of rail line in the State of Kansas.