Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: None.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** located at the FAA, Alaskan Region Airports Division, Anchorage, Alaska.

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

Issued in Anchorage, Alaska on September 1, 1998.

David S. Stelling,

Acting Manager, Airports Division, Alaskan Region.

[FR Doc. 98–24418 Filed 9–10–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: Travis and Williamson Counties, TX

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that the scope (project limits) of the environmental impact statement (EIS) for the proposed State Highway 45 project in Travis and Williamson Counties, Texas, will be revised. This notice amends the NOI for proposed State Highway 45 that was published in the **Federal Register** on October 31, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Walter C. Waidelich, District Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, Room 850, Federal Building, 300 East 8th Street, Austin, Texas 78701, (512) 916–5988. Stacey Benningfield, Environmental Manager, Texas Turnpike Authority Division, Texas Department of Transportation, 125 E. 11th Street, Austin, Texas 78701–2483, (512) 936–0983.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: As initially planned SH 45 was to extend from FM 685 north of Pflugerville, Texas, westerly to a termini at U.S. Highway 183 (a distance of approximately 22.5 kilometers or 14 miles) with a 1.1. kilometer (0.7 mile) transition to existing Ranch-to-Market Road 620.

Based on preliminary traffic and engineering analyses, it was determined that the western project terminus and 1.1 kilometer (0.7 mile) transitional area, as originally proposed, would not provide for efficient dissipation of traffic demand and would, in fact, contribute to congestion on US 183, Anderson Mill Road and RM 620. To provide for efficient traffic movement in the western portion of the project area, it is necessary to extend the western project limit to Anderson Mill Road (Ranch-to-Market Road 2769). West of Anderson Mill Road the proposed facility will be transitioned back to existing RM 620. The environmental impact statement for proposed State Highway 45 will address the entire 26.1 kilometer (16.2 miles) length of the revised limits of State Highway 45 including the transitional area west of Anderson Mill Road.

Since publication of the original NOI in October 1997, the proposed SH 45 project has been identified as a turnpike project candidate. Accordingly, the Texas Department of Transportation has assigned project development responsibility to its Turnpike Authority Division (TTA). The proposed project is now being developed by the FHWA in cooperation with the TTA.

As currently envisioned, between Anderson Mill Road in southwest Williamson County and proposed State Highway 130 in northeast Travis County, the proposed facility will be initially constructed and operated as a controlled access toll road. Frontage roads will be provided in some areas, but will not be continuous throughout the length of the proposed project. Between Anderson Mill Road and proposed State Highway 130 the ultimate facility design is anticipated to be a six-lane controlled access freeway with frontage roads.

From State Highway 130 to FM 685, the eastern project termini, the proposed facility will be a non-toll 4-lane divided highway.

In conjunction with preparation of the EIS for State Highway 45 and selection of a preferred alternative, the TTA will conduct a toll feasibility study to evaluate the viability of developing the selected alternative as a toll road (except in the area east of proposed State Highway 130) and financing it, in whole or in part, through the issuance of revenue bonds. The toll road designation will not influence the selection of a preferred alternative. Proposed alternatives, including alternative alignments, will be evaluated for how well they meet the established purpose and need for the proposed project. Any impacts owing to the toll road designation will be discussed in the environmental impact statement.

On October 7, 1998, the TTA will conduct a public meeting to discuss the proposed State Highway 45 project. The purpose of the public meeting will be to receive comments on the proposed project. During the public meeting, particular emphasis will be placed upon the portion of the proposed facility to be located within the expanded project limits. The meeting will be held at Noel Grisham Middle School, 10805 School House Lane, Austin, Texas 78750. From 6:00 to 7:00 p.m., displays showing the preliminary alternatives corridors will be available for review. During this time, TTA staff will be available to answer questions. At 7:00 p.m. there will be a formal project presentation followed by a public comment period. All interested citizens are invited to attend this meeting.

A public hearing will be held after publication for the Draft EIS. Public notice will be given of the time and place of the hearing. The Draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment prior to the public hearing.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed, and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comments or questions concerning the proposed action and the EIS should be directed to the FHWA or TTA at the addresses provided above.

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

Walter C. Waidelich,

District Engineer, Austin, Texas.

[FR Doc. 98–24445 Filed 9–10–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Petition for Exemption From the Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Ford

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Grant of petition for exemption.

SUMMARY: This notice grants in full the petition of Ford Motor Company (Ford) for an exemption of a high-theft line, the Ford Mustang, from the parts-marking requirements of the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard. This petition is granted because the agency has determined that the antitheft device

to be placed on the line as standard equipment is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard.

DATES: The exemption granted by this notice is effective beginning with model year (MY) 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Rosalind Proctor, Office of Planning and Consumer Programs, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington DC 20590. Ms. Proctor's telephone number is (202) 366–0846. Her fax number is (202) 493–2739.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In a petition dated January 21, 1998, Ford requested an exemption from the parts marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard (49 CFR Part 541) for the Crown Victoria and Grand Marquis vehicle lines beginning in MY 1999. Ford also requested that the agency also consider its petition for its Taurus and Sable vehicle lines beginning in MY 2000 which will also be equipped with the same standard equipment antitheft system as Ford proposes for installation on its Crown Victoria and Grand Marquis vehicle lines for the 1999 model year.

However, Section 543.5(a) specifically states that ''For each of model years 1997 through 2000, a manufacturer may petition NHTSA to grant an exemption for one additional line of its passenger motor vehicles from the requirements of Part 541 of this chapter.'' Therefore, the agency advised Ford that the company must decide which of the two lines it would request to petition for exemption from the parts-marking requirements for MYs 1999 and 2000 respectively. Subsequently by letter dated May 4, 1998, Ford chose to withdraw its original petition for exemption for the MY 1999 Crown Victoria and Grand Marquis lines, and the MY 2000 Taurus and Sable vehicle lines. In Ford's May 4 withdrawal letter, it also requested an exemption from the parts-marking requirements for its Mustang vehicle line beginning with MY 1999. Accordingly, May 4, 1998, is the date on which the statutory 120-day period for processing Ford's petition began. The petition is pursuant to 49 CFR Part 543, Exemption From Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard, based on the installation of an antitheft device as standard equipment for the entire line.

Ford's submittal is considered a complete petition, as required by 49 CFR Part 543.7, in that it met the general requirements contained in § 543.5 and the specific content requirements of § 543.6.

In its petition, Ford provided a detailed description and diagram of the identity, design, and location of the components of the antitheft device for the new line. Ford will install its antitheft device, the SecuriLock Passive Anti-Theft Electronic Engine Immobilizer System (SecuriLock) as standard equipment on the MY 1999 Ford Mustang.

In order to ensure the reliability and durability of the device, Ford conducted tests, based on its own specified standards. Ford provided a detailed list of the tests conducted and stated its belief that the device is reliable and durable since it complied with Ford's specified requirements for each test. The environmental and functional tests conducted were for thermal shock, high temperature exposure, low-temperature exposure, powered/thermal cycle, temperature/humidity cycling, constant humidity, end-of-line, random vibration, tri-temperature parametric, bench drop, transmit current, lead/lock strength/integrity, output frequency, resistance to solvents, output field strength, dust, and electromagnetic compatibility.

The Ford SecuriLock is a transponder-based electronic immobilizer system. The device is activated when the driver/operator turns off the engine by using the properly coded ignition key. When the ignition key is turned to the start position, the transponder (located in the head of the key) transmits a code to the powertrain's electronic control module. The vehicle's engine can only be started if the transponder code matches the code previously programmed into the powertrain's electronic control module. If the code does not match, the engine will be disabled. Ford stated that there are seventy-two quadrillion different codes and each transponder is hard-coded with a unique code at the time of manufacture. Additionally, Ford stated that the communication between the SecuriLock control function and the powertrain's electronic control module are encrypted.

Ford stated that its SecuriLock system incorporates a theft indicator using a light-emitting diode (LED) that provides information to the driver/operator as to the ''set'' and ''unset'' condition of the device. When the ignition is initially turned to the ''ON'' position, a 3-second continuous LED indicates the proper ''unset'' state of the device. When the ignition is turned to ''OFF'', a flashing LED indicates the ''set'' state of the device and provides visual information that the vehicle is protected by the SecuriLock system. Ford states that the integration of the setting/unsetting device (transponder) into the ignition key prevents any inadvertent activation of the device.

Ford believes that it would be very difficult for a thief to defeat this type of electronic immobilizer system. Ford believes that its new device is reliable and durable because its does not have any moving parts, nor does it require a separate battery in the key. If the correct code is not transmitted to the electronic control module (accomplished only by having the correct key), there is no way to mechanically override the system and start the vehicle. Furthermore, Ford stated that drive-away thefts are virtually eliminated with SecuriLock's sophisticated design and operation of the electronic engine immobilizer system which makes conventional theft methods (i.e., hot-wiring or attacking the ignition-lock cylinder) ineffective. Ford reemphasized that any attempt to slam-pull the ignition-lock cylinder will have no effect on a thief's ability to start the vehicle.

Ford's SecuriLock antitheft device was voluntarily installed on all Mustang GT and Cobra models as standard equipment in MY 1996. Ford notes that in comparing the National Crime Information Center's (NCIC) CY 1995–1996 theft data for MY 1995 Mustang GT and Cobra vehicles without an immobilizer device installed with MY 1996 data for Mustang GT and Cobra vehicles with an immobilizer device installed, approximately a 75% reduction in theft is shown. Additionally, Ford stated that its SecuriLock device has been installed on the entire Mustang vehicle line as standard equipment since MY 1997.

As part of its submission, Ford also provided a Highway Loss Data Institute (HLDI)'s theft loss bulletin, Vol. 15, No. 1, September 1997, which evaluated 1996 Ford Mustang and Taurus models fitted with the SecuriLock device and corresponding 1995 models without the SecuriLock device. The results as reported by HLDI indicated a reduction in overall theft losses by approximately 50% for both Mustang and Taurus models.

Additionally, Ford stated that its SecuriLock device has been demonstrated to various insurance companies, and as a result AAA Michigan and State Farm now give an antitheft discount of 25% and 10% respectively on premiums for comprehensive insurance for all Ford vehicles equipped with the device.

Ford's proposed device, as well as other comparable devices that have received full exemptions from the parts-marking requirements, lack an audible or visible alarm. Therefore, these devices cannot perform one of the

functions listed in 49 CFR Part 542.6(a)(3), that is, to call attention to unauthorized attempts to enter or move the vehicle. However, theft data have indicated a decline in theft rates for vehicle lines that have been equipped with antitheft devices similar to that which Ford proposes. In these instances, the agency has concluded that the lack of a visual or audio alarm has not prevented these antitheft devices from being effective protection against theft.

On the basis of comparison, Ford has concluded that the antitheft device proposed for its vehicle line is no less effective than those devices in the lines for which NHTSA has already granted full exemptions from the parts-marking requirements.

Based on the evidence submitted by Ford, the agency believes that the antitheft device for the Ford Mustang vehicle line is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standard (49 CFR Part 541).

The agency believes that the device will provide four of the five types of performance listed in 49 CFR Part 543.6(a)(3): promoting activation; preventing defeat or circumvention of the device by unauthorized persons; preventing operation of the vehicle by unauthorized entrants; and ensuring the reliability and durability of the device.

As required by 49 U.S.C. 33106 and 49 CFR Part 543.6(a)(4) and (5), the agency finds that Ford has provided adequate reasons for its belief that the antitheft device will reduce and deter theft. This conclusion is based on the information Ford provided about its antitheft device.

For the foregoing reasons, the agency hereby grants in full Ford Motor Company's petition for an exemption for the MY 1999 Mustang vehicle line from the parts-marking requirements of 49 CFR Part 541.

If Ford decides not to use the exemption for this line, it must formally notify the agency, and, thereafter, the line must be fully marked as required by 49 CFR Parts 541.5 and 541.6 (marking of major component parts and replacement parts).

NHTSA notes that if Ford wishes in the future to modify the device on which this exemption is based, the company may have to submit a petition to modify the exemption. Part 543.7(d) states that a Part 543 exemption applies only to vehicles that belong to a line exempted under this part and equipped with the anti-theft device on which the line's exemption is based. Further, § 543.9(c)(2) provides for the submission of petitions ''to modify an exemption to permit the use of an antitheft device similar to but differing from the one specified in that exemption.'' The agency wishes to minimize the administrative burden that § 543.9(c)(2) could place on exempted vehicle manufacturers and itself. The agency did not intend in drafting Part 543 to require the submission of a modification petition for every change to the components or design of an antitheft device. The significance of many such changes could be *de minimis*. Therefore, NHTSA suggests that if the manufacturer contemplates making any changes the effects of which might be characterized as *de minimis*, it should consult the agency before preparing and submitting a petition to modify.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 33106; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.

Issued on September 4, 1998.

L. Robert Shelton,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 98–24489 Filed 9–10–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Docket No. AB–33 (Sub–No. 125X)]

Union Pacific Railroad Company—Abandonment Exemption—in Orange County, CA

On August 24, 1998, Union Pacific Railroad Company (UP) filed with the Surface Transportation Board (Board) a petition under 49 U.S.C. 10502 for exemption from the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 10903–05 [1] to abandon a 3.84-mile line of railroad known as the Los Alamitos Branch extending from milepost 514.26 near Los Alamitos Junction to the end of the line at milepost 518.10 near Los Alamitos, in Orange County, CA. The line traverses U.S. Postal Service Zip Code 90720, and includes the non-agency station of Los Alamitos at milepost 518.10.

The line does not contain federally granted rights-of-way. Any documentation in the railroad's possession will be made available promptly to those requesting it.

The interest of railroad employees will be protected by *Oregon Short Line R. Co.— Abandonment—Goshen,* 360 I.C.C. 91 (1979).

By issuance of this notice, the Board is instituting an exemption proceeding pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 10502(b). A final decision will be issued by December 11, 1998.

Any offer of financial assistance (OFA) under 49 CFR 1152.27(b)(2) will be due no later than 10 days after service of a decision granting the petition for exemption. Each OFA must be accompanied by the filing fee, which currently is set at $1,000. *See* 49 CFR 1002.2(f)(25).

All interested persons should be aware that, following abandonment of rail service and salvage of the line, the line may be suitable for other public use, including interim trail use. Any request for a public use condition under 49 CFR 1152.28 or for trail use/rail banking under 49 CFR 1152.29 will be due no later than October 1, 1998. Each trail use request must be accompanied by a $150 filing fee. *See* 49 CFR 1002.2(f)(27).

All filings in response to this notice must refer to STB Docket No. AB–33 (Sub-No. 125X) and must be sent to: (1) Surface Transportation Board, Office of the Secretary, Case Control Unit, 1925 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20423–0001; and (2) Joseph D. Anthofer, 1416 Dodge Street, Room 830, Omaha, NE 68179–0830.

Persons seeking further information concerning abandonment procedures may contact the Board's Office of Public Services at (202) 565–1592 or refer to the full abandonment or discontinuance regulations at 49 CFR part 1152. Questions concerning environmental issues may be directed to the Board's Section of Environmental Analysis (SEA) at (202) 565–1545. [TDD for the hearing impaired is available at (202) 565–1695.]

An environmental assessment (EA) (or environmental impact statement (EIS), if necessary) prepared by SEA will be served upon all parties of record and upon any agencies or other persons who commented during its preparation. Other interested persons may contact SEA to obtain a copy of the EA (or EIS). EAs in these abandonment proceedings normally will be made available within 60 days of the filing of the petition. The deadline for submission of comments on the EA will generally be within 30 days of its service.

Board decisions and notices are available on our Website at ''WWW.STB.DOT.GOV.''

Decided: September 1, 1998.

[1] In addition to an exemption from 49 U.S.C. 10903, UP seeks exemption from 49 U.S.C. 10904 (offer of financial assistance procedures) and 49 U.S.C. 10905 (public use conditions). These requests will be addressed in the final decision.