into the Advanced Qualification Program codified in SFAR 58.

Dispositions of Petitions

Docket No.: 26223.

Petitioner: Airbus Service Company, Inc.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 121.411(a)(2) and (3) and (b)(2); 121.413(b), (c), and (d); and appendix H, part 121.

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To extend Exemption No. 5302, as amended, which permits Airbus Service Company, Inc., (Airbus) to use the instructors listed in its original exemption who do not meet all of the applicable training requirements of part 121, subpart N or the employment requirements of part 121, appendix H, to train employees of part 121 certificate holders in FAA-approved simulators and in turbojet-powered airplanes manufactured by Airbus.

GRANT, December 29, 1995, Exemption No. 5302B

Docket No.: 26223.

Petitioner: Airbus Service Company, Inc.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 61.55(b)(2); 61.56(c)(1); 61.57(c) and (d); 61.58(c)(1) and (d); 61.63(c)(2) and (d)(2) and (3); 61.65(c), (e)(2) and (3) and (g); 61.67(d)(2); 61.157(d)(1) and (2) and (e)(1) and (2); 61.191(c); and appendix A, part 61.

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To extend Exemption No. 6032, which permits Airbus to use FAA-approved simulators to meet certain flight experience requirements of part 61.

GRANT, December 28, 1995, Exemption No. 6032A

Docket No.: 26821.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 61.57(d).

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To extend Exemption No. 5742, as amended, which permits pilots employed by MCI to increase the interval between recency of flight experience requirements and to accomplish some recency of night experience in Level C or Level D simulators.

PARTIAL GRANT, December 29, 1995, Exemption No. 5742B

Docket No.: 28274.

Petitioner: Samoa Air.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 135.180.

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit Samoa Air to operate two deHavilland Twin Otter (DHC–6) airplanes without an approved traffic alert and collision avoidance System (TCAS I) installed.

DENIAL, December 29, 1995, Exemption No. 6250

Docket No.: 28355.

Petitioner: USAir, Inc., and Southwest Airlines Co.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 121.359(a).

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit USAir and Southwest Airlines Co., Boeing–737 (B–737) flightcrews experiencing an uncommanded flight control input to deactivate the cockpit voice recorder (CVR) upon clearing the active runway after landing.

GRANT, December 29, 1995, Exemption No. 6387

Docket No.: 28412.

Petitioner: Polynesian Limited.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 129.18(b).

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To allow Polynesian Limited to operate two deHavilland Twin Otter (DHC–6) airplanes that are not equipped with an approved traffic collision and avoidance system (TCAS I) at Pago Pago, American Samoa, after December 31, 1995.

DENIAL, December 29, 1995, Exemption No. 6386.

[FR Doc. 96–2852 Filed 2–8–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Notice of Intent To Rule on Application (#96–01–C–00–LAR) To Impose and Use the Revenue From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) at Laramie Regional Airport, Submitted by Laramie Regional Airport, Laramie, WY

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 PFC revenue at Laramie Regional Airport under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 40117 and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 158).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before March 11, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Alan Wiechmann, Manager; Denver Airports District Office, DEN-ADO; Federal Aviation Administration; 5440 Roslyn, Suite 300; Denver, CO 80216–6026.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Jack Skinner, Airport Business Manager at the following address: Laramie Regional Airport, 555 General Brees Road, Laramie, WY 82070.

Air Carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to Laramie Regional Airport, under section 158.23 of Part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Barbara Johnson, (303) 286–5533; Denver Airports District Office, DEN-ADO; Federal Aviation Administration; 5440 Roslyn, Suite 300; Denver, CO 80216–6026. 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 (#91–01–C–00–LAR) to impose and use PFC revenue at Laramie Regional Airport, under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 40117 and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 158).

On February 1, 1996, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by Laramie Regional Airport, Laramie, Wyoming, was substantially complete within the requirements of section 158.25 of Part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whose or in part, no later than May 3, 1996.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

Level of the proposed PFC: $3.00.

Proposed charge effective date: March 1, 1996.

Proposed charge expiration date: April 30, 2000.

Total estimated PFC revenues: $128,000.00.

Brief description of proposed project: Terminal building remodel.

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

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: Federal Aviation Administration, Northwest Mountain Region, Airports Division, ANM–600, 1601 Lind Avenue S.W., Suite 540, Renton, WA 98055–4056.

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

Issued in Renton, Washington, on February 1, 1996.

David A. Field,

Manager, Planning, Programming, and Capacity Branch, Northwest Mountain Region.

[FR Doc. 96–2848 Filed 2–8–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: Jefferson County, WV

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an environmental impact statement (EIS) will be prepared for a proposed highway project in Jefferson County, West Virginia.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David A. Leighow, Division Environmental Coordinator, Federal Highway Administration, 550 Eagan Street, Suite 300, Charleston, West Virginia 25301, Telephone (304) 347–5329; or, Ben L. Hark, Environmental Section Chief, roadway Design Division, West Virginia Department of Transportation, 1900 Kanawha Boulevard East, Building 5, Room A–416, Capitol Complex, Charleston, West Virginia 25305–0430, Telephone (304) 558–2885.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the West Virginia Department of Transportation (WVDOT), will prepare an EIS for the US 340 Virginia Line to Charles Town project in Jefferson County, West Virginia. The proposed limits extend from the existing four-lane section of US 340 southwest of the Virginia/West Virginia state line to the existing four lane section of the Charles Town Bypass (US 340) in Wheaton, West Virginia, approximately 3 kilometers (2 miles) north of Rippon. The total length of the proposed project is approximately 6.5 kilometers (4 miles). The project will be processed as a merged NEPA/404 project.

Alternatives under consideration include but are not limited to (1) taking no action, (2) minimal improvement of the existing road, (3) where possible, widening the existing two-lane highway to four lanes, and (4) constructing a four-lane, partially controlled access highway on new location. Additional alignments may be evaluated based upon the results of the preliminary engineering studies and the public and agency involvement process. Incorporated into and studied with the various build alternatives will be design variations of grade and alignment. Multi-modal forms of transportation, such as mass transit, will be considered and addressed as appropriate.

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate federal, state, and local agencies, and to private organizations and citizens who have previously expressed, or are known to have interest in this project. A formal scoping meeting will be scheduled, along with a field view. Public meetings and a public hearing will be held during the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) review period. Public notice will be given of the times and places for the meetings and hearing. The DEIS 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 the proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS should be directed to the FHWA at the address provided above.

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

Issued on: January 29, 1996.

David A. Leighow,

Environmental Coordinator, Charleston, West Virginia.

[FR Doc. 96–2781 Filed 2–8–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–M

Federal Railroad Administration

[FRA Emergency Order No. 18, Notice No. 1]

Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway Company; Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad; Emergency Order Requiring Capability To Initiate Emergency Application of Air Brakes From the Head End and Rear of Trains

The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) of the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) has determined that public safety compels issuance of this Emergency Order requiring that all westward trains operated by the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway Company (ATSF) on the Cajon Subdivision, between Barstow milepost 745.9 and Baseline milepost 79.9, have the capability to initiate an emergency application of the air brakes from both the head and rear of the train. ATSF recently merged with the Burlington Northern Railroad to form Burlington Northern Santa Fe. To the extent this new entity's activities have an effect on the train operations in question, it is covered by this order.

Authority

Authority to enforce Federal railroad safety laws has been delegated by the Secretary of Transportation to the Federal Railroad Administrator. 49 CFR § 1.49. Railroads are subject to FRA's safety jurisdiction under the Federal railroad safety laws. 49 U.S.C. 20101, 20103. FRA is authorized to issue emergency orders where an unsafe condition or practice ''causes an emergency situation involving a hazard of death or personal injury.'' 49 U.S.C. 20104. These orders may immediately impose such ''restrictions and prohibitions * * * that may be necessary to abate the situation.'' *(Ibid.)*

Background

ATSF's line of railroad between Barstow and Los Angeles, California, consists of double main track which passes through the San Bernardino Mountains via ''Cajon Pass.'' The route for westward moving trains involves a steady climb from Barstow to Summit, California, a distance of approximately 55 miles. At Summit, the line begins a descent westward with a more than 3 percent grade on one track and a more than 2 percent grade on the other track. The descent for eastward trains is not nearly as severe. Trains in this area operate by authority of a centralized traffic control system managed by ATSF train dispatchers. The Union Pacific Railroad (UP) also operates its trains through this same corridor via a trackage rights agreement with ATSF. The Southern Pacific Railroad operates trains through Cajon Pass, but on a right-of-way separate from that of ATSF.

On December 14, 1994, a westbound Santa Fe intermodal freight train operating between Barstow and San Bernardino, California collided with the rear end of a UP unit coal train resulting in the serious injury of two crew members and total estimated damages in excess of $4 million. Investigation of the accident revealed that an apparent blockage or restriction of the trainline (i.e., the connected system of metal pipes and flexible air hoses that runs end-to-end through the train) inhibited the normal brake pipe air flow resulting in incomplete train braking. After investigation of this incident, the National Transportation Safety Board