of compliance, the applicant should provide data and substantiation on how the artificial means will effectively simulate the critical, desired operational consideration.

The concentration of snow entering the inlet in blowing snow will normally exceed the amount in falling snow; hence, the need to address ''blowing snow.'' Therefore, the location of the inlets should be considered to determine critical directions of blowing snow in relation to snow accumulation on impingement surfaces. Snow blowing in excess of 15 knots is the desired compliance condition. Means such as use of another airplane's propeller, taxiing the airplane in excess of 15 knots, and so forth, may be used to simulate blowing.

An additional area of emphasis for § 23.1093(b)(1)(ii) compliance is the words in the regulation ''. . .within the limitations established for the airplane for such operation.'' As with all environmental considerations, such as rain, ice, hail, lightning, and so forth, operation in snow is considered an unavoidable, meteorological hazard that must be addressed. The only plausible Flight Manual limitation that may be acceptable would be prohibitions for ground operations such as taxi, take-off, engine runs, and so forth. However, the case of flying into snow after deployment must be considered.

Ice Fog

The basic requirement contained in § 23.1093(b)(2), also incorporated by Amendment 23–15, addresses the condition of idling the engine on the ground to ensure no adverse ice build-up (for example, no surges, adverse power loss, and so forth), commonly referred to as ''ice fog.'' A way to view the § 23.1093(b)(2) requirement is as an extension upon the 14 CFR part 25, Appendix C icing envelope addressed in § § 23.1093(b)(1)(i) and 23.1419. Therefore, the methodologies and analysis used for compliance with § 23.1093(b)(1)(i) can be extended for § 23.1093(b)(2) compliance.

It is often difficult to encounter all the ambient conditions required by § 23.1093(b)(2); therefore, when testing, one or more of the conditions is typically simulated. For example, a common and acceptable method of compliance is using water spray devices to simulate the water conditions required, while testing at the required ambient temperature conditions. Other manufacturers have used thermal analysis combined with dry air tests using ice shapes/simulated blockage to demonstrate compliance, which is also acceptable if properly substantiated.

The rule allows an engine run-up periodically to higher power settings to shed ice. As with snow testing, if run-ups are performed during compliance demonstration, then these procedures should be incorporated as limitations in the Flight Manual. Also, before run-ups are accepted, the practicality of the procedures should be evaluated.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on October 23, 2001.

Michael Gallagher,

Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 01–28000 Filed 11–6–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 34116]

Union Pacific Railroad Company—Trackage Rights Exemption—Chicago, Central & Pacific Railroad Company

Union Pacific Railroad Company (UP) and Chicago, Central & Pacific Railroad Company (CCP) have agreed to modify the compensation terms of an existing trackage rights agreement, dated July 6, 1887, as supplemented and amended, covering trackage rights CCP previously granted to UP over its rail line between CCP milepost 484.9 near LeMars, IA, and CCP milepost 509.0 near Sioux City, IA.

The transaction was scheduled to become effective on October 30, 2001.

As a condition to this exemption, any employees affected by the transaction 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. 34116, 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 Robert T. Opal, General Commerce Counsel, 1416 Dodge Street, Room 830, Omaha, NE 68179.

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

Decided: October 31, 2001.

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

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01–27824 Filed 11–6–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915–00–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[Finance Docket No. 27590 (Sub–No. 2)]

TTX Company, *et al.*—Application for Approval of the Pooling of Car Service With Respect to Flat Cars

AGENCY: Surface Transportation Board.

ACTION: Decision.

SUMMARY: In 1994, the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), the predecessor to the Surface Transportation Board (Board), granted TTX Company (TTX) a 10-year extension of its authority to pool rail cars, subject to the ICC's continuing monitoring during the term of TTX's extension. In July 2001, the Board invited comments from interested parties on whether any of TTX's activities require oversight action by the Board. Because no comments were filed, the Board is taking no further action and is discontinuing its monitoring during the remainder of TTX's 10-year term.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This decision will be effective on its date of service.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Melvin F. Clemens, Jr., (202) 565–1573. [TDD for the hearing impaired: 1–800–877–8339.]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In 1989, after reviewing anticompetitive concerns by the United States Department of Justice and other parties, the ICC granted the request by TTX for an extension of its pooling authority, but for only a 5-year term.[1] In its decision, the ICC also subjected TTX to a number of new operating restrictions and imposed a monitoring and annual reporting requirement on the pool. In 1994, prior to the expiration of the 5-year term, the ICC granted TTX a 10-year extension of its pooling authority, approved TTX's request for limited authority to assign rail cars, and continued monitoring by requiring the ICC's Office of Compliance and

[1] This extension of pooling authority was approved in *Trailer Train Co., Et Al.—Pooling—Car Service*, 5 I.C.C.2d 552 (1989).