

Decision Date: March 27, 2008.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
Trang Tran, Seattle Airports District  
Office, (425) 227-1662.

AMENDMENTS TO PFC APPROVALS

Amendment No., city, state	Amendment approved date	Original approved net PFC revenue	Amended approved net PFC revenue	Original estimated charge exp. date	Amended estimated charge exp. date
00-03-C-02-CHA, Chattanooga, TN	02/13/08	\$19,746,474	\$5,752,115	01/01/12	08/01/10
01-08-C-02-BNA, Nashville, TN	03/03/08	4,514,173	4,328,889	10/01/02	10/01/02
92-01-C-02-GUM, Agana, CU	03/04/08	800,000	568,661	06/01/94	06/01/94
95-01-C-03-SYR, Syracuse, NY	03/17/08	6,737,425	3,954,577	04/01/97	04/01/97
94-01-C-01-LSE, LaCrosse, WI	03/18/08	795,299	571,966	08/01/97	08/01/97
96-02-C-03-LSE, LaCrosse, WI	03/19/08	84,367	84,734	11/01/99	11/01/99
97-03-C-03-LSE, LaCrosse, WI	03/19/08	485,000	473,343	03/01/00	03/01/00
97-04-C-01-LSE, LaCrosse, WI	03/19/08	615,000	245,313	03/01/02	09/01/01
*03-02-C-02-LGB, Long Beach, CA	03/21/08	62,344,903	62,344,903	05/01/17	10/01/14
06-03-C-01-LGB, Long Beach, CA	03/21/08	7,148,186	7,148,186	12/01/18	11/01/15

Notes: The amendment denoted by an asterisk (\*) includes a change to the PFC level charged from \$3.00 per enplaned passenger to \$4.50 per enplaned passenger. For Long Beach, CA this change is effective on May 1, 2008.

Issued in Washington, DC on April 8, 2008.

**Myrn Rivera,**

Acting Manager, Financial Analysis and Passenger Facility Charge Branch.

[FR Doc. E8-8066 Filed 4-15-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Federal Railroad Administration**

**Petition for Waiver of Compliance**

In accordance with Part 211 of Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), notice is hereby given that the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) received a request for a waiver of compliance with certain requirements of its safety standards. The individual petition is described below, including the party seeking relief, the regulatory provisions involved, the nature of the relief being requested, and the petitioner's arguments in favor of relief.

**Association of American Railroads**

(Waiver Petition Docket Number FRA-2008-0015)

The Association of American Railroads (AAR), on behalf of its member railroads, seeks a waiver of compliance with the Locomotive Safety Standards, 49 CFR Parts 229.27(a)(2) and 229.29(a), as they pertain to the requirements to clean, repair and test airbrake equipment associated with locomotive remote control systems manufactured by Cattron-Theimeg Inc. (Accuspeed, Beltpack, and Cantrac

brands); Control Chief Corporation (MU & Go, Train Chief II, and Plug & Go brands); and General Electric Company (Locotrol brand). AAR requests to change the time interval requirements for the additional air brake equipment to align with the requirements for the other brake equipment on each locomotive, set by waiver for locomotives equipped with 26L air brakes at 1,104 days if not equipped with an air dryer (Docket No. H-80-7) or 1,472 days if equipped with an air dryer (Docket No. FRA-2005-21325) and at 5 years or longer for locomotives equipped with electronic air brakes (Docket Nos. FRA-2000-7367, FRA-2002-13397, FRA-1999-6252 and FRA-2005-21613).

In support of its application, AAR states that a precedent has been established by waiver Docket Number FRA-2006-24224, which granted relief to the Canadian National Railway (CN), extending the clean, repair and test interval to 1,472 days for remote control brake valves in the Cattron-Theimeg Beltpack brand systems. AAR contends that there is no reason that one railroad be permitted longer inspection intervals than other railroads and that there is also no justification for giving one remote control system longer inspection intervals than other systems.

AAR recognizes that the CN waiver retains the requirement for cleaning air brake filtering devices every 368 days and agrees to this restriction. As attachments to the waiver petition, AAR also submitted letters from Cattron-Theimeg recommending a 5-year inspection interval for their three remote control locomotive (RCL) systems, a letter from Control Chief recommending a 48-month service interval for all of their RCL air brake components, and a page from the

General Electric Locotrol Maintenance manual recommending a 5-year interval.

Interested parties are invited to participate in these proceedings by submitting written views, data, or comments. FRA does not anticipate scheduling a public hearing in connection with these proceedings since the facts do not appear to warrant a hearing. If any interested party desires an opportunity for oral comment, they should notify FRA, in writing, before the end of the comment period and specify the basis for their request.

All communications concerning these proceedings should identify the appropriate docket number (e.g., Waiver Petition Docket Number 2008-0015) and may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Web site: <http://www.regulations.gov>.

Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

Fax: 202-493-2251.

Mail: Docket Operations Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., W12-140, Washington, DC 20590.

Hand Delivery: 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Room W12-140, Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.

Communications received within 45 days of the date of this notice will be considered by FRA before final action is taken. Comments received after that date will be considered as far as practicable. All written communications concerning these proceedings are available for examination during regular business hours (9 a.m.-5 p.m.) at the above facility. All documents in the public docket are also available for inspection and copying on the Internet at the docket facility's Web site at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

Anyone is able to search the electronic form of any written communications and comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477-78).

Issued in Washington, DC on April 9, 2008.

**Grady C. Cothen, Jr.,**

*Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Standards and Program Development.*

[FR Doc. E8-8103 Filed 4-15-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-06-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Railroad Administration

#### Safety Advisory 2008-01

**AGENCY:** Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of Safety Advisory; damage to intermediate air hose elbow connection on certain freight cars equipped with end-of-car cushion devices.

**SUMMARY:** FRA's Office of Safety Assurance and Compliance Motive Power and Equipment (MP&E) Division has been notified that certain freight cars equipped with end-of-car cushioning (EOCC) devices may have damage to a 90-degree elbow connected to the trainline angle cock.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tom Blankenship, Mechanical Engineer, MP&E Division (RRS-14); FRA Office of Safety Assurance and Compliance, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590, telephone: (202) 493-6446.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On newly constructed freight cars, the air brake trainline must pass the Association of American Railroads (AAR) Standard S-471, *Brake Pipe Restriction Test*. This requirement is used to verify the clear and open path of air to adequately operate the train air brake system. The *Brake Pipe Restriction Test* requires that a 1-inch round nylon ball be transmitted through the trainline under air pressure of 80 psi.

The intermediate air hose arrangement, as shown in Rule 4, Figure 22 of the Field Manual of the AAR Interchange Rules, shows a 90-degree swivel elbow connected to the angle cock. The intermediate air hose (located between the angle cock and the standard air brake hose) has this 90-degree elbow attached to the air hose end of the angle

cock. When cars are uncoupled while charged with air, the glad hand on the standard air brake hose can (if not properly restrained) whip back and strike the 90-degree elbow. The violent impact of the glad hand striking this elbow causes the elbow to bend or flatten and subsequently restrict the air flow. This bending or flattening of the 90-degree elbow, if uncorrected, can cause sticking brakes, wheel tread buildup, and diminished capacity of the train air brake system. Freight cars with bent or flattened 90-degree elbows are in violation of Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) section 232.205(c)(3), which states in part, "air hoses shall be properly coupled and shall not kink, bind, or foul or be in any other condition that restricts air flow."

FRA has found damage to the intermediate air hose arrangement 90-degree elbow on ATSF 621000-, ATSF 622000-, and BNSF 534000-series cars owned by BNSF Railway (BNSF). BNSF has implemented an aggressive program to address this issue on cars in their ownership by fleet inspection and repair of cars found with damage to the 90-degree elbow.

Additional cars that have been observed with this type of defect include LW 42000-series box cars and TBOX 660000-series box cars.

*Recommended Action:* Recognizing the need to ensure safety, FRA recommends that railroads and car owners that operate freight cars equipped with EOCC devices having intermediate air hoses with 90-degree elbows subject to the damage described above initiate an inspection and repair program to ensure cars are maintained in accordance with AAR Interchange Rule 4, Figure 22, and that the trainline is not obstructed or restricted.

FRA may modify this Safety Advisory 2008-01, issue additional safety advisories, or take other appropriate action necessary to ensure the highest level of safety on the Nation's railroads.

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 9, 2008.

**Jo Strang,**

*Associate Administrator for Safety.*

[FR Doc. E8-8104 Filed 4-15-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-06-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Transit Administration

#### Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Project in the Portland, OR Metropolitan Area

**AGENCY:** Federal Transit Administration (FTA), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Notice of Intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Metro (the regional government that serves the 25 cities and three counties of the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area), in cooperation with the cities of Lake Oswego and Portland, Clackamas and Multnomah counties; Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon (TriMet), will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to evaluate the benefits and impacts of proposed transit improvements. Three alternatives are proposed: (1) A No-Build alternative that includes everything in the Metro Regional Transportation Plan, not including the proposed project, and with a continuation of present day bus service policies in place of the project; (2) a streetcar alternative that would extend the existing Portland Streetcar system approximately 1.2 miles to a short terminus in Johns Landing, or 5.7 miles to a terminus in downtown Lake Oswego, with connecting bus service in the corridor, and (3) an enhanced bus alternative with capital improvements between downtown Portland and Lake Oswego and connecting bus service to the rest of the corridor. FTA and Metro will prepare the EIS in accordance with FTA regulations (23 CFR 771 *et seq.*) implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and with the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). This Notice alerts interested parties of the intent to prepare the EIS, provides information on the nature of the proposed transit project, invites participation in the EIS process (including comments on the scope of the EIS proposed in this notice), and announces an upcoming public scoping meeting.

**DATES:** *Comment due date:* Written comments on the scope of the EIS, including the preliminary purpose and need for transit improvements in the corridor, the alternatives to be considered, the environmental and