

repayment terms for the plan. If a home equity plan advertisement contains a trigger term, creditors must also state the following: (1) the periodic rate used to compute the finance charge (expressed as an APR), (2) loan fees that are a percentage of the credit limit along with an estimate of other plan fees, and (3) the maximum APR that could be imposed in a variable-rate plan.

If a minimum payment for the home equity line is stated, the advertisement must also state if a balloon payment will result. And if an advertisement for a variable-rate plan states a rate other than one based on the contract's index and margin, the advertisement must also state how long the introductory rate will be in effect. The APR figured on the current index and margin must be disclosed with equal prominence to the introductory rate.

III. Request for Comments

The Board requests comment on how existing credit advertising rules could be modified to increase consumer benefit and decrease creditor costs. Comment is also requested if the current rules could be modified, if at all, for radio advertisements without diminishing consumer protection. For example, Section 336 of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 provides for an abbreviated disclosure scheme for radio leasing advertisements. Before the statutory revisions, if a trigger term (such as a payment amount) were used in a leasing advertisement, as many as six additional disclosures were required to be given. Under the statutory amendments, lessors may substitute a reference to a toll-free telephone number or to a specified print advertisement for the disclosures about purchase options and end of term liability. If consumers call the toll-free number, they must receive all the required disclosures (not simply the ones omitted from the radio advertisement). Alternatively, all of the disclosures could be provided in a publication of general circulation in the community served by the radio station.

Comment is requested on whether the use of toll-free numbers in lieu of providing specific disclosures is warranted. Comment is also requested on whether changes to radio advertisements should be extended to other broadcast media (such as television), given similar time constraints for delivering disclosures.

The Board will submit its report to the Congress in early fall 1995, based on the comments of interested parties and its own analysis.

By order of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, June 21, 1995.

William W. Wiles,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 95-15681 Filed 6-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 95-AWA-3]

Proposed Establishment of Class C Airspace and Revocation of Class D Airspace, Cyril E. King Airport; VI

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This notice proposes to establish a Class C airspace area and revoke the existing Class D airspace area at the Cyril E. King Airport, Charlotte Amalie St. Thomas, VI. The Cyril E. King Airport is a public-use facility with a Level II control tower served by Limited Radar Approach Control. The establishment of this Class C airspace area would require pilots to maintain two-way radio communications with air traffic control (ATC) while in Class C airspace. Implementation of the Class C airspace area would promote the efficient control of air traffic and reduce the risk of midair collision in the terminal area.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before August 4, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on the proposal in triplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Office of the Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket [AGC-10], Airspace Docket No. 95-AWA-3, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591.

The official docket may be examined in the Rules Docket, Office of the Chief Counsel, Room 916, weekdays, except Federal holidays, between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

An informal docket may also be examined during normal business hours at the office of the Regional Air Traffic Division, P.O. Box 20636, Atlanta, GA 30320.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patricia P. Crawford, Airspace and Obstruction Evaluation Branch (ATP-240), Airspace-Rules and Aeronautical Information Division, Air Traffic Rules and Procedures Service, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone: (202) 267-9255.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested parties are invited to participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Comments that provide the factual basis supporting the views and suggestions presented are particularly helpful in developing reasoned regulatory decisions on the proposal. Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, aeronautical, economic, environmental, and energy-related aspects of the proposal.

Communications should identify the airspace docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address listed above. Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments on this notice must submit with those comments a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: "Comments to Airspace Docket No. 95-AWA-3." The postcard will be date/time stamped and returned to the commenter. All communications received on or before the specified closing date for comments will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in light of comments received. All comments submitted will be available for examination in the Rules Docket both before and after the closing date for comments. A report summarizing each substantive public contact with FAA personnel concerned with this rulemaking will be filed in the docket.

Availability of NPRM's

Any person may obtain a copy of this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) by submitting a request to the Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Public Affairs, Attention: Public Inquiry Center, APA-220, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, or by calling (202) 267-3485. Communications must identify the notice number of this NPRM. Persons interested in being placed on a mailing list for future NPRM's should also request a copy of Advisory Circular No. 11-2A, which describes the application procedure.

Background

On April 22, 1982, the National Airspace Review (NAR) plan was published in the **Federal Register** (47 FR 17448). The plan encompassed a review of airspace use and procedural aspects of the ATC system. Among the main objectives of the NAR was the improvement of the ATC system by

increasing efficiency and reducing complexity. In its review of terminal airspace, NAR Task Group 1-2 concluded that Terminal Radar Service Areas (TRSA's) should be replaced. Four types of airspace configurations were considered as replacement candidates, of which Model B, since redesignated Airport Radar Service Area (ARSA), was recommended by a consensus of the task group.

The FAA published NAR Recommendation 1-2.2.1, "Replace Terminal Radar Service Areas with Model B Airspace and Service" in Notice 83-9 (July 28, 1983; 48 FR 34286) proposing the establishment of ARSA's at the Robert Mueller Municipal Airport, Austin, TX, and the Port of Columbus International Airport, Columbus, OH. ARSA's were designated at these airports on a temporary basis by SFAR No. 45 (October 28, 1983; 48 FR 50038) to provide an operational confirmation of the ARSA concept for potential application on a national basis.

Following a confirmation period of more than a year, the FAA adopted the NAR recommendation and, on February 27, 1985, issued a final rule (50 FR 9252; March 6, 1985) defining ARSA airspace and establishing air traffic rules for operation within such an area.

Concurrently, by separate rulemaking action, ARSA's were permanently established at the Austin, TX, Columbus, OH, and the Baltimore/Washington International Airports (50 FR 9250; March 6, 1985). The FAA stated that future notices would propose ARSA's for other airports at which TRSA procedures were in effect.

Additionally, the NAR Task Group recommended that the FAA develop quantitative criteria for proposing to establish ARSA's at locations other than those which were included in the TRSA replacement program. The task group recommended that these criteria include, among other things, traffic mix, flow and density, airport configuration, geographical features, collision risk assessment, and ATC capabilities to provide service to users. These criteria have been developed and are being published via the FAA directives system.

The FAA has established ARSA's at 121 locations under a paced implementation plan to replace TRSA's with ARSA's. This is one of a series of notices to implement ARSA's at locations with TRSA's or locations without TRSA's that warrant implementation of an ARSA. Airspace Reclassification, effective September 16, 1993, reclassified ARSA's as Class C airspace areas. This change in

terminology is reflected in the remainder of this NPRM.

This notice proposes Class C airspace designation at a location which was not identified as a candidate for Class C in the preamble to Amendment No. 71-10 (50 FR 9252). Other candidate locations will be proposed in future notices published in the **Federal Register**.

The Cyril E. King Airport is a public-use airport with an operating Level II control tower served by Limited Radar Approach Control. Passenger enplanements reported at Cyril E. King Airport were 640,642, 583,817, and 602,373, respectively, for calendar years 1993, 1992, and 1991. This volume of passenger enplanements and aircraft operations meets the FAA criteria for establishing Class C airspace to enhance safety.

The Proposal

The FAA is considering an amendment to part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 71) to establish a Class C airspace area and revoke the Class D airspace area at the Cyril E. King Airport, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, VI. Cyril E. King Airport is a public airport with a Level II operating control tower served by Limited Radar Approach Control.

The FAA published a final rule (50 FR 9252; March 6, 1985) which defines Class C airspace, and prescribes operating rules for aircraft, ultralight vehicles, and parachute jump operations in Class C airspace areas. The final rule provides, in part, that all aircraft arriving at any airport in Class C airspace or flying through Class C airspace must: (1) prior to entering the Class C airspace, establish two-way radio communications with the ATC facility having jurisdiction over the area; and (2) while in Class C airspace, maintain two-way radio communications with that ATC facility. For aircraft departing from the primary airport within Class C airspace area, or a satellite airport with an operating control tower, two-way radio communications must be established and maintained with the control tower and thereafter as instructed by ATC while operating in Class C airspace. For aircraft departing a satellite airport without an operating control tower and within Class C airspace, two-way radio communications must be established with the ATC facility having jurisdiction over the area as soon as practicable after takeoff and thereafter maintained while operating within the Class C airspace area (14 CFR 91.130).

Pursuant to Federal Aviation Regulations section 91.130 (14 CFR part 91) all aircraft operating within Class C

airspace are required to comply with sections 91.129 and 91.130. Ultralight vehicle operations and parachute jumps in Class C airspace areas may only be conducted under the terms of an ATC authorization.

The FAA adopted the NAR Task Group recommendation that each Class C airspace area be of the same airspace configuration insofar as is practicable. The standard Class C airspace area consists of that airspace within 5 nautical miles of the primary airport, extending from the surface to an altitude of 4,000 feet above that airport's elevation, and that airspace between 5 and 10 nautical miles from the primary airport from 1,200 feet above the surface to an altitude of 4,000 feet above that airport's elevation. Proposed deviations from this standard have been necessary at some airports because of adjacent regulatory airspace, international boundaries, topography, or unusual operational requirements. The proposed Class C airspace area for the Cyril E. King Airport would consist of that airspace extending upward from the surface to and including 4,000 feet MSL within a 5-mile radius of the airport, and that airspace extending upward from 1,900 feet MSL to and including 4,000 feet MSL within a 10-mile radius of the airport.

Definitions and operating requirements applicable to Class C airspace may be found in section 71.51 of part 71 and sections 91.1 and 91.130 of part 91 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR parts 71, 91). The coordinates for this airspace docket are based on North American Datum 83. Class C and Class D airspace designations are published, respectively, in paragraphs 4000 and 5000 of FAA Order 7400.9B dated July 18, 1994, and effective September 16, 1994, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. The Class C airspace designation listed in this document would be published subsequently in the Order and the Class D airspace designation listed in this document would be removed subsequently from the Order.

Regulatory Evaluation Summary

The FAA has determined that this rulemaking is not a "significant rulemaking action," as defined by Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review). The anticipated costs and benefits associated with this notice are summarized below. (A detailed discussion of costs and benefits is contained in the full evaluation in the docket for this notice.)

Costs

The establishment of the proposed St. Thomas Class C airspace area would impose a one-time FAA administrative cost of \$600. For the aviation community (namely, aircraft operators and fixed-based operators), the NPRM would impose little, if any, operating or equipment cost. The potential costs are presented below.

For the proposed Class C airspace area, the FAA does not expect to incur any additional costs for ATC staffing, training, or facility equipment. The FAA is confident that it can handle any additional traffic that would participate in radar services through more efficient use of personnel at the current staffing level.

The FAA holds an informal public meeting at each proposed Class C airspace area location. These meetings provide pilots with the best opportunity to learn both how a Class C airspace area works and how it would affect their local operations. The expenses associated with these public meetings are incurred regardless of whether a Class C airspace area is ultimately established. Thus, they are more appropriately considered routine FAA costs. If the proposed Class C airspace area becomes a final rule, any subsequent public information costs would be strictly attributed to the proposal. For instance, the FAA would distribute a Letter To Airmen to all pilots residing within 50 miles of the Class C airspace area site. The Letter to Airmen would cost approximately \$600. This one-time negligible cost would be incurred upon the initial establishment of the proposed Class C airspace area.

The FAA anticipates that some pilots who currently transit the terminal area without establishing radio communications may choose to navigate around the proposed airspace. However, the FAA contends that these operators could navigate around, over, or, in certain cases, under the airspace without significantly deviating from their regular flight paths.

The FAA recognizes that delays might develop at St. Thomas following the initial establishment of the Class C airspace area. However, those delays that do occur are typically transitional in nature. The FAA contends that any potential delays would eventually be more than offset by the increased flexibility afforded controllers in handling traffic as a result of Class C separation standards. This has been the experience at other Class C airspace areas.

Aircraft operating in the vicinity of the proposed airspace already have a

requirement for two-way radio communications capability and, therefore, would not be expected to incur any additional costs.

If the proposed Class C airspace area becomes a final rule, operators would be subject to the Mode C Rule. That rule requires all aircraft to be equipped with an operable transponder with Mode C capability when operating in and above a Class C airspace area (up to 10,000 feet mean sea level (MSL)). Some aircraft operators may have to acquire (or upgrade to) a Mode C transponder as a result of the proposed airspace. However, the cost of acquiring a Mode C transponder for all aircraft in the U.S. was completely accounted for as a cost of the Mode C Rule.

The FAA has also adopted regulations requiring certain aircraft operators to install Traffic Collision Avoidance System (TCAS), which allows air carriers to determine the position of other aircraft from the signal emitted by Mode C transponders. TCAS issues conflict resolution advisories as to what evasive actions are most appropriate for avoiding potential midair collisions. The TCAS Rule would not contribute to the potential costs of the proposed Class C airspace area, but it would contribute to the potential safety benefits. The benefits of the proposed St. Thomas Class C airspace area are discussed below.

Benefits

The primary benefit of the proposed St. Thomas Class C airspace area would be enhanced aviation safety for the increasing number of passengers carrying aircraft transiting through this airspace. The volume of passenger enplanements at St. Thomas has risen dramatically. Enplanements in 1995 are projected to be 648,000, up from 491,000 in 1990; by the year 2000, enplanements are projected to be 810,000. This high volume of passenger enplanements has made St. Thomas eligible to become a Class C airspace area. The complexity of aircraft operations at St. Thomas has also increased. Complexity refers to air traffic conditions resulting from a mix of controlled or uncontrolled aircraft (pilots that are not in contact with ATC) that vary widely in speed and maneuverability. As this mix increases, so does the potential for midair collisions.

To study the effect that Class C airspace areas has on reducing this risk of midair collisions, the FAA looked at the occurrences of near-midair collisions (NMAC). In a study of NMAC data, the FAA's Office of Aviation Safety found that approximately 15

percent of reported NMAC's occur in airspace similar to that at St. Thomas. This study found that about half of all NMAC's occur in the 1,000- to 5,000-foot altitude range, which is closely comparable to the altitudes where aircraft operate around airports that qualify for Class C airspace areas. This study also found that over 85 percent of NMAC's occur in visual flight rules (VFR) conditions when visibility is 5 miles or greater. Finally, the study found that the largest number of NMAC reports are associated with instrument flight rules (IFR) operators under radar control conflicting with VFR traffic during VFR flight conditions below 12,500 feet. The mandatory participation requirements of the Class C airspace area and the radar services provided by ATC to VFR as well as IFR pilots would help alleviate such conflicts.

Ordinarily, the benefit of a reduction in the risk of midair collisions from establishing a Class C airspace area would be attributed entirely to establishing the proposed Class C airspace area. However, an indeterminate amount of the benefits has to be credited to the interaction of the proposed Class C airspace area (and the Class C airspace area program in general) with the Mode C Rule, which in turn, interacts with the TCAS Rule. The proposed Class C airspace area, as well as other designated airspace actions that require Mode C transponders, cannot be separated from the benefits of the Mode C and TCAS Rules. These four actions would share potential benefits totaling \$4.4 billion.

Comparison of Costs and Benefits

The proposed rule to establish a Class C airspace area at St. Thomas, VI, would impose a negligible cost of \$600 on the agency. When this cost estimate of \$600 is added to the total cost of establishing the other Mode-C-dependent airspace classes and the Mode C Rule and TCAS Rule, the costs would still be less than their total potential safety benefits. The proposal would also generate some benefits in the form of enhanced operational efficiency while imposing little, if any, additional operating costs on pilots who choose to remain clear of the proposed airspace. Thus, the FAA believes that the proposed rule would be cost-beneficial.

International Trade Impact Assessment

The proposal would only affect U.S. terminal airspace operating procedures at and in the vicinity of St. Thomas, VI. The proposal would not impose a competitive trade disadvantage on foreign firms in the sale of either foreign

aviation products or services in the United States. In addition, domestic firms would not incur a competitive trade disadvantage in either the sale of United States aviation products or services in foreign countries.

Initial Regulatory Flexibility Determination

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA) was enacted by Congress to ensure that small entities are not unnecessarily and disproportionately burdened by government regulations. Small entities are independently owned and operated small businesses and small not-for-profit organizations. The RFA requires agencies to review rules that may have "a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities."

Under FAA Order 2100.14A entitled *Regulatory Flexibility Criteria and Guidance*, a significant economic impact means annualized net compliance cost to an entity, which when adjusted for inflation, is greater than or equal to the threshold cost level for that entity. A substantial number of small entities means a number that is eleven or more and is more than one-third the number of the small entities subject to a proposed or existing rule.

For the purpose of this evaluation, the small entities that would be potentially affected by the proposed rule are fixed-base operators, flight schools, banner towing, seaplane shuttle bases, and other small aviation businesses located at and around St. Thomas. By using cutouts, special procedures, and Letters of Agreement between ATC and the affected parties, the FAA would make an effort to eliminate any adverse affect practicable on the operations of small entities in the vicinity of St. Thomas. The FAA has utilized such arrangements extensively in implementing other Class C airspace

areas in the past. In addition, any delay problems that may initially develop following implementation would be transitory. This has been the experience at other Class C airspace areas. Thus, the proposed rule would not result in a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Federalism Implications

The regulations adopted herein will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this proposed rule would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

Conclusion

For the reasons discussed under "Regulatory Evaluation," the FAA has determined that this rule (1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; and (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979). It is also certified that this rule does not require preparation of a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis under the RFA.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

The Proposed Amendment

In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

PART 71—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 71 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); 14 CFR 11.69.

§ 71.1 [Amended]

2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of the Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9B, *Airspace Designations and Reporting Points*, dated July 18, 1994, and effective September 16, 1994, is amended as follows:

Paragraph 4000 Subpart C—Class C Airspace

* * * * *

ASO VI C Charlotte Amalie St. Thomas, VI [New]

Cyril E. King Airport
(lat. 18°20'19" N., long. 64°58'11" W.)

That airspace extending upward from the surface to and including 4,000 feet MSL within 5-mile radius of the Cyril E. King Airport; and that airspace extending upward from 1,900 feet to 4,000 feet MSL within a 10-mile radius of the airport from the 075° bearing from the airport clockwise to the 020° bearing from the airport. This Class C airspace area is effective during the specific dates and times established in advance by a Notice to Airmen. The effective date and time will thereafter be continuously published in the Airport/Facility Directory.

* * * * *

Paragraph 5000 Subpart D—Class D Airspace

* * * * *

ASO VI D Charlotte Amalie Cyril E. King Airport, St. Thomas, VI [Removed]

* * * * *

Issued in Washington, DC, on June 12, 1995.


Harold W. Becker,

Manager, Airspace-Rules and Aeronautical Information Division.

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

ST. THOMAS CLASS C AIRSPACE AREA

(Not to be used for navigation)



Prepared by the
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
Publications Branch
ATP-210