possible azimuths for GSO launches); (3) launching along a range of azimuths between 82.6° and 97.4° but avoiding specific azimuths within this range that would overfly any nation's National Park or National Reserve. Two alternatives were carried forward and considered in detail in the Draft EA including: (1) Launching along a range of azimuths between 82.6° and 97.4° but avoiding any azimuth that would overfly any of the Oceanic Islands (Galapagos Islands, Cocos Island, and Malpelo Island) and (2) launching along a range of azimuths between 82.6° and 97.4° but avoiding any azimuths that overfly the Galapagos Islands. The No Action Alternative was also considered in detail. Under the No Action alternative, FAA would not issue a LOL to SLLP. SLLP would continue to prepare and submit launch-specific applications for individual licenses to launch up to six satellites per year, including appropriate environmental analyses and documentation to support launch-specific applications when required.

Potential impacts of the license applicant's proposed action were analyzed in the Draft EA. Potential environmental impacts of successful launch vehicle flight include impacts to the geology, oceanography, atmospheric processes, and biological communities within the overflight and stage and fairing deposition areas. Additionally, possible impacts to commercial activities in these areas were analyzed. Potential environmental impacts of three failed mission scenarios were also considered including: (1) Possible failure at the launch platform, (2) possible failure during Stage I and Stage II flight over open ocean, and (3) possible failure during Upper Stage flight over the ocean, Oceanic Islands, or South America. Finally, potential environmental impacts associated with the avoidance of the Oceanic Islands alternative and the avoidance of the Galapagos Islands alternative were also analyzed. The impacts of the No Action Alternative would be the same as those addressed in the FAA's Final Environmental Assessment for the Sea Launch Project (February 11, 1999).

Potential cumulative impacts of each phase of the launch operation associated with eight SLLP launches per year for five years, or a maximum of 40 proposed launches, over the broader range of azimuths of the license applicant's proposed action are also addressed in the Draft EA.

Based on the Draft EA, FAA will determine whether there are potentially significant impacts requiring preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or whether to issue a Final EA and Environmental Finding Document finding no significant impact.

Dated: May 11, 2001.

Herb Bachner,

Manager, Space Systems Development Division.

[FR Doc. 01–12390 Filed 5–16–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

[Summary Notice No. PE–2001–38]

Petitions for Exemption; Summary of Dispositions of Petitions Issued

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of dispositions of prior petitions.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to FAA's rulemaking provisions governing the application, processing, and disposition of petitions for exemption part 11 of Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR), this notice contains a summary of dispositions of certain petitions previously received. The purpose of this notice is to improve the public's awareness of, and participation in, this aspect of FAA's regulatory activities. Neither publication of this notice nor the inclusion or omission of information in the summary is intended to affect the legal status of any petitioner or its final disposition.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Forest Rawls (202) 267–8033, Sandy Buchanan-Sumter (202) 267–7271, or Vanessa Wilkins (202) 267–8029, Office of Rulemaking (ARM–1), Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591.

This notice is published pursuant to 14 CFR 11.85 and 11.91.

Issued in Washington, DC., on May 14, 2001.

Donald P. Byrne,

Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations.

Disposition of Petitions

Docket No.: 29725.
Petitioner: Federal Express Corporation.
Section 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 121.417(c)(2)(i).
Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To provide FedEx relief from the requirement that each flight crewmember perform hands-on emergency drills and operate certain emergency equipment every 24 months during recurrent training.
Denial, 04/30/2001, Exemption No. 7521.

Docket No.: FAA–2001–9228.
Petitioner: Bridger Aviation Services, Inc.
Section 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 135.143(2)(2).
Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To permit Bridger to operate certain aircraft under part 135 without a TSO–C112 (Mode S) transponder installed in the aircraft.
Grant, 04/26/2001, Exemption No. 7519.

Docket No.: FAA–2001–8745.
Petitioner: Caribou Air Service.
Section 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 135.143(c)(2).
Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To permit Caribou to operate certain aircraft under part 135 without a TSO–C112 (Mode S) transponder installed in the aircraft.
Grant, 04/26/2001, Exemption No. 7518.

Docket No.: FAA–2001–8743.
Petitioner: Beaver Air Taxi, LLC.
Section of 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 135.143(c)(2).
Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To permit Beaver Air to operate certain aircraft under part 135 without a TSO–C112 (Mode S) transponder installed in the aircraft.
Grant, 04/26/2001, Exemption No. 7517.

Docket No.: FAA–2001–9043.
Petitioner: Horizon Air Industries, Inc.
Section of 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 121.344(a)(14), (a)(29), (a)(33), (a)(40), (a)(44), and (a)(54).
Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To permit Horizon and all similarly situated air carriers to operate the Bombardier CL–600–2C10 airplane without recording the parameters listed in § 121.344(a)(14), (a)(29), (a)(33), (a)(40), (a)(44), and (a)(54) within the ranges, accuracies, resolutions, and recording intervals specified in appendix M to part 121.
Denial, 04/27/2001, Exemption No. 7520.

Docket No.: 28855.
Petitioner: Offshore Logistics, Inc.
Section of 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 135.152(a).
Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To amend Exemption No. 6714, as amended, which permits Offshore to operate certain helicopters under part 135 without an approved digital flight data recorder installed on each helicopter. By (1) changing the name of the exemption holder from Offshore Logistics, Inc., to Air Logistics, L.L.C., and (2) updating the list of helicopters covered by the exemption.
Grant, 05/04/2001, Exemption No. 6714C.

Docket No.: FAA–2001–8738.
Petitioner: DHL Airways, Inc.
Section of 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 121.344(b)(3).
Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To allow DHL to operate two Airbus 300B4–200 series airplanes (Registration Nos. N367DH and N366DH) without installing in each the airplane the required digital flight data recorder.
Grant, 05/04/2001, Exemption No. 7522.

Docket No.: FAA–2000–8423.
Petitioner: Alaska Flying Network.
Section of 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 135.251, 135.255, 135.353, and appendixes I and J of part 121.
Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To permit AFN to conduct no more than four local sightseeing flights at an airport in the vicinity of Kenai, AK, as part of a raffle to

raise funds for local charities, at a date and time to be determined by you and recipient(s) of the flight, for compensation or hire, without complying with certain anti-drug and alcohol misuse prevention requirements of part 135.

Grant, 04/27/2001, Exemption No. 7274A.

[FR Doc. 01–12488 Filed 5–16–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 34021]

Central Michigan Railway Company and CSX Transportation, Inc.—Joint Relocation Project Exemption—in Saginaw, MI

Central Michigan Railway Company (CMGN) has filed a notice of exemption under 49 CFR 1180.2(d)(5) to relocate its rail operations within the City of Saginaw, MI, from a portion of its line to a portion of line owned by CSX Transportation, Inc. (CSXT). CMGN will operate over the portion of the line owned by CSXT by overhead trackage rights. CMGN states that the transaction will be consummated by September 1, 2001, but not before April 26, 2001, the effective date of the exemption.[1]

CMGN operates over an approximately 1.92-mile rail line entirely in Saginaw, from CMGN milepost 0.07, at or near the Denmark Switch, to CMGN milepost 1.99, at or near Hoyt Diamond, MI (subject line). CMGN currently connects with CSXT at milepost BB 07, at or near Mershon Switch.

Under the joint relocation project, CMGN and CSXT propose the following trans (1) CMGN will acquire overhead trackage rights over approximately 2.9 miles of rail line owned by CSXT from milepost BBO 7 at or near the Mershon Switch east to milepost CB 1 near the Saginaw Yard (a distance of approximately 1.7 miles), then from milepost CB 1 southeast to milepost CC 2.2, at or near the Hoyt Diamond (a distance of approximately 1.2 miles), at which point CMGN would connect with its main line;[2] (2) CMGN will abandon its operations from CMGN milepost 0.07 at or near the Denmark Switch to CMGN milepost 1.99 at or near the Hoyt Diamond (the subject line); and (3) CMGN will construct a new public team track facility, approximately 570 feet long beginning at CSXT milepost CC 2.1 on CSXT's line and connecting with CMGN at approximately CMGN's milepost 2.04.

The proposed joint relocation project will not disrupt service to shippers.[3] Its purpose is to eliminate approximately 22 grade crossings (8 of which cross major system routes) pursuant to a highway improvement project funded by CMGN, CSXT, the Michigan Department of Transportation, the City of Saginaw and TEA–21 Local Safety Program funds. Thus, it will enhance public safety by reducing the risk of crossing accidents. The notice further states that CSXT's trackage rights provides an alternate route by which CMGN can access its own rail line. There will be no expansion into new territory; nor will there be a change in the existing competitive situation.

The Board will exercise jurisdiction over the abandonment or construction components of a relocation project, and require separate approval or exemption, only where the removal of track affects service to shippers or the construction of new track involves expansion into a new territory. *See City of Detroit* v. *Canadian National Ry. Co., et al.,* 9 I.C.C.2d 1208 (1993), *aff'd sub nom., Detroit/Wayne County Port Authority* v. *ICC,* 59 F.3d 1314 (D.C. Cir. 1995). Line relocation projects may embrace trackage rights transactions such as the one involved here. *See D.T.&I.R.—Trackage Rights,* 363 I.CC. 878 (1981). Under these standards, the incidental abandonment, construction, and trackage rights components require no separate approval or exemption when the relocation project, as here, will not disrupt service to shippers and thus qualifies for the class exemption at 49 CFR 1180.2(d)(5).

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).

If the notice 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. 34021, 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 Rose-Michele Weinryb, Weiner Brodsky Sidman Kider PC, 1300 19th Street, NW., Fifth Floor, Washington, DC 20036–1609.

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

Decided: May 10, 2001.

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

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01–12345 Filed 5–16–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915–00–P

[1] An unredacted version of the trackage rights agreement between CMGN and CSXT, as required by 49 CFR 1180.6(a)(7)(ii), was concurrently filed with the notice of exemption under seal along with a motion for a protective order. A protective order was served on May 2, 2001.

[2] CMGN's use of the trackage rights would make its rail operations more efficient. It would further allow CMGN to access its shippers east of the Hoyt Diamond by having a more direct route between the Saginaw Yard and the Hoyt Diamond after it interchanges with CSXT.

[3] By letter dated April 11, 2001, Self-Serve Lumber, the only shipper on the line fully supports the proposed relocation and incidental abandonment by CMGN.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 34026]

Summit View, Inc.—Control Exemption—Mahoning Valley Railroad Company

AGENCY: Surface Transportation Board, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of exemption.

SUMMARY: Under 49 U.S.C. 10502, the Board exempts from the prior approval requirements of 49 U.S.C. 11323, *et seq.*, the acquisition by Summit View, Inc. (Summit) of control of Class III rail carrier Mahoning Valley Railroad Company (MVRC). Summit is a noncarrier holding company that controls eight Class III rail carriers.[1] MVRC's capital stock is owned by Cuyahoga Valley Railway Company which, in turn, is a wholly owned subsidiary of LTV Steel Company (LTV).[2] On March 28, 2001, Summit submitted to the Board for review and

[1] Ohio Central Railroad, Inc., Ohio Southern Railroad, Inc., Youngstown Belt Railroad, Inc., Warren & Trumbull Railroad, Ohio & Pennsylvania Railroad, Youngstown & Austintown Railroad, Pittsburgh & Ohio Central Railroad, and Columbus & Ohio River Railroad Company.

[2] LTV, MVRC's largest shipper, is presently engaged in voluntary reorganization proceedings under Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code. LTV has sought and secured conditional approval from the Bankruptcy Court to sell MVRC and other non-core assets as promptly as practicable in order to streamline LTV's operations and emerge a stronger and more efficient organization by selling a number of assets that are either unproductive or nonessential.