

Estimated charge expiration date: March 1, 1996.

Total approved net PFC revenue: \$175,588.00.

Brief description of proposed project: Construct Partial Parallel Taxiway "C".

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

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

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

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois, on August 18, 1995.

Benito DeLeon,

Manager, Planning/Programming Branch, Airports Division, Great Lakes Region.

[FR Doc. 95-21307 Filed 8-25-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

Federal Highway Administration

[FHWA Docket No. 95-14]

Framework for Guiding FHWA Policy Decisions Affecting Freight Transportation

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Interim policy statement; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This notice requests comments on a draft framework intended to identify the principles which will guide FHWA policy decisions affecting freight transportation systems. These principles do not reflect a priority in their order—they move from the most generic concepts through to more specific ones, and contain many common elements. This framework focuses on the highway element of those freight transport systems but recognizes the importance of intermodal connectivity for a growing portion of U.S. freight transport. This interim statement could serve as a building block for a broader Departmental intermodal freight policy. In addition to a brief discussion of each of the principles, several key current issues are discussed that illustrate how the principles are reflected in questions of Federal interest.

DATES: Comments should be received by October 27, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit written, signed statements to FHWA Docket No. 95-14,

FHWA, Room 4232, HCC-10, Office of the Chief Counsel, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. All statements received in Docket No. 95-14 will be available for examination at the above address between 8:30 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Those desiring notification of receipt of their statements must include a self-addressed, stamped envelope or postcard.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Thomas Keane, Office of Policy Development, Transportation Studies Division, at (202) 366-9242; or Mr. Charles Medalen, Office of Chief Counsel, Motor Carrier Law Division, at (202) 266-1354, FHWA, DOT, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Office hours are from 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Efficient, effective, and safe highway systems play a critical role in the U.S. economy; nearly all the essentials of modern life travel on them, whether in the delivery of intermediate goods to production plants or shipment of goods to final market. The highway system is an especially important foundation of commerce as it provides access to raw materials, labor, and markets. Maintaining and improving highways and their connections to intermodal freight facilities, while producing a safe environment for the traveling public, ensures shippers and carriers the freedom to adapt quickly to changing markets and environments with some measure of confidence that the spatial barriers between markets can be overcome. Therefore, the FHWA has developed a draft framework of principles by which to guide policy decisions having an impact on freight transportation systems. The FHWA invites comments on this draft framework, which is set forth below.

Draft Policy

Part I—The Principles

Highway and intermodal freight transport policy can be fashioned to improve the Nation's long-term economic prospects and vitality. As in all policy decisions considering the interests of the public at large, a balance must be struck among many worthy goals. In defining the public interest, Federal highway programs and freight-related policies should advance the following principles:

1. Reflect the Importance of Freight Transportation to National and Regional Economies

Transportation policy with regard to investment and regulatory decisions must take into consideration the impacts that such policies may have on the movement of both people and goods.

The relationship between transportation and economic development is obvious. Highways and other modes of transportation enable individuals to commute to their workplaces; transportation is also a critical part of the production process. While the magnitude of the relationship has been debated, it is well known that the quality of the transportation system is closely tied to the industrial and employment base of regions. Good, dependable transportation is an important factor in any region's current economic well-being as well as its growth potential. The U.S. economy as a whole is highly integrated and is becoming more closely tied to the global economy. To retain and expand its economic vitality and competitive position, the Nation must ensure that its producers and carriers have quality access at the lowest reasonable cost, and in turn, that its markets are accessible.

A basic characteristic of highway networks is that automobiles, trucks, and buses share the common highway. The combination of large freight vehicles with a smaller, lighter passenger car fleet causes special safety risks. Large vehicles impose unique demands on their drivers and those sharing the road with them. Their size and handling characteristics must be taken into consideration in the design of roadways. Increasingly, the environment in which the vehicle is operated is congested and physically deteriorated. Infrastructure planners, providers, and operators should adopt a customer orientation for freight movement, recognizing that freight and passenger transportation are distinctly different markets with fundamentally different requirements.

2. Adopt a Long-Term Perspective for Freight Decisions

Since investments in highway infrastructure have such long usable lives, decisions should be as future-oriented as possible, taking into account the current and future demands of the freight market.

Transportation agencies should maintain, operate, and improve highway systems commensurate with current and projected demand. One element of that investment is the development of an

understanding (qualitatively and quantitatively) of the demand for goods movement and its incorporation into planning and forecasting. Lack of effective transportation can lead to the demise of business and jobs or be an impediment to growth in any area of the State. Agencies should recognize that freight demand is dynamic: the mix of supply and demand changes over time.

Although State Departments of Transportation and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) have relatively sophisticated passenger transportation planning procedures, most agencies have little experience in developing forecasts of freight transportation movements for statewide freight transportation plans. The transportation needs of basic industries are important criteria in setting program priorities. Economic considerations should be combined with other measures of transportation need to develop plans for transportation systems and networks. Life-cycle cost principles should be reflected at the program, management system, and project level.

Increasingly all modes of freight transportation are using computerized technologies to track cargo and improve the efficiency of pickup, delivery, and terminal operations. Work underway in the commercial vehicle operations element of the Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) program holds great promise for augmenting private sector programs by improving the efficiency and safety of motor carrier operations, including intermodal operations. These kinds of forward-looking considerations should be incorporated into a future-oriented vision of freight demand.

3. Ensure that Priority Consideration for Safety is Affirmed

The DOT's strategic plans have clearly enunciated the importance of safety. We are guided by a vision statement which leads with "the Nation's need for the safe . . . movement of people and goods . . ." and a mission statement which follows with a pledge to "[i]mprove all aspects of surface transportation safety." The plan's safety goal is to "[i]mprove surface transportation safety through a coordinated effort to reduce fatalities, injuries, property damage, and hazardous material incidents."

The rationale for Federal involvement in transportation safety has been that the marketplace alone will not produce an acceptable level of transportation safety and, therefore, it should be provided by the public sector. Government policies are established to ensure that the truck and bus industries operate safely. The ultimate goal of these policies has been to prevent

accidents and minimize the loss associated with accidents. Whenever the government issues regulations or allocates resources that affect motor carrier safety, it balances the public's desire for efficiency and mobility in transport services with the desire for improved safety.

While many truck safety policies are initiated at the Federal level, responsibility for truck safety investment and oversight is shared among all levels of government and the industry. The recognition of this shared responsibility has led to major improvements in truck safety over the last several years.

Improving truck safety will require increased attention to: operator proficiency; improvements in vehicle design and performance; improved data collection and more comprehensive information to target resources at high risk carriers; better analysis and more focused research on vehicle and driver performance, coupled with greater use of technical innovations; a stronger link between Federal, State, local, and private industry safety initiatives; and designing road systems to accommodate large vehicles.

Technology, innovation, and research hold great potential to improve the productivity and safety of freight transportation. Various technologies being developed under the ITS program should substantially improve motor carrier safety and productivity. On-board safety sensors to automatically measure the safe condition of the vehicle can be a reality in the near future. Existing vehicle technologies such as antilock braking systems, B-trains and double drawbar dollies also are available to improve the safety of multi-trailer combinations.

4. Promote Equity and Cost-Effectiveness

Decisions regarding allocating resources and imposing regulatory controls should be equitable and cost-effective. They should recognize the costs imposed across industry sectors, across transport modes, across regions, and across classes of consumers. To the maximum extent possible, each mode and class of user should pay the costs of public facilities and services provided for their operations.

Direct or indirect subsidies may affect competition among the freight modes. Such subsidies result when user fees and other policies result in the various modes not paying the full costs of their operations. To the extent compatible with other goals, government subsidies that affect competition among the modes should be minimized.

Since governmental agencies are allocating scarce public resources, investment options should be evaluated against the opportunity cost in the private market. Threshold criteria should require benefits to exceed the cost. The benefits and costs which accrue directly to freight carriers and indirectly to their customers should be explicitly included in evaluations of system improvements and/or regulations. The assessment of infrastructure investment and regulatory controls should include measurement of the full range of impacts, appropriately discounted over their entire life cycle. For example, this means that the impacts of delay and vehicle operating costs, rehabilitation and maintenance activities in work zones should be taken into consideration. Another example relates to incorporating economic benefits derived from system efficiencies which accrue to communities and shippers, often referred to as economic development benefits.

5. Encourage an Integrated, Intermodal Systems Approach

The difficulties that result from different modes and carriers working together should not be aggravated by unnecessary governmental barriers or inadequate connections due to poor system design.

The productivity of trucking firms and their customers depend on highways and their connections with truck terminals, ports, railroads, and airports. Moving freight by a combination of two or more modes in an integrated manner is an option that allows the superior attributes of each mode to be utilized. This does not mean that multi-modal movements are inherently better than single-mode movements. It does mean that, given the latitude to choose the best mode(s) for the move, carriers will be able to provide the most efficient transport with the potential for the lowest cost. Developments in U.S. manufacturing practice contribute to the growing trend toward intermodal shipments. It is critical that State and MPO plans, programs, and management systems address intermodal access and connections.

The National Highway System (NHS) will facilitate U.S. international trade and growing domestic productivity through improved efficiencies in the movement of goods produced for and by U.S. businesses. Improving the quality of connections among transportation modes, aiming toward smooth and seamless interchange, along with improving the highway links

themselves, are two examples of the benefits that will accrue from designation of the NHS.

6. Be Sensitive to Externalities Caused by Transportation of Goods

Take appropriate action to reduce or mitigate externalities.

Many costs of highway freight transportation are not accounted for in the marketplace and thus are not recognized directly by motor carrier operators. These costs include environmental impacts (such as exhaust emissions, noise, and community impacts) and safety. Some of these external costs can be mitigated by regulatory actions (e.g., requiring cleaner or quieter vehicles), or programmatic means (e.g., improved traffic safety inspection programs). Market pricing approaches such as emissions or congestion pricing have also been proposed.

It is important to estimate the incidence and magnitude of external costs associated with highway freight transportation before regulatory or pricing solutions are implemented. It also is important to estimate the impacts of such solutions on motor carriers, including impacts on their competitive position versus other modes. A further consideration is the extent to which external costs are associated with operations of those competing modes.

The importance of these estimates is reflected in Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) planning reforms, which require consideration of factors such as social, economic, energy, environmental, and land use/development effects of transportation decisions. Quantification should be encouraged as a means to bring these issues into the policy equation, with a common measure of value. The estimates and their use should reflect the limitations of such analysis. Methodologies and techniques for capturing these impacts should be pursued vigorously.

7. Provide an Environment That Will Enable the Transportation Industry To Be Strong and Internationally Competitive

Recognize that a strong and internationally competitive transportation industry requires a sound and effective regulatory framework that reserves economic regulation only for the most obvious instances of transportation market failure. Within that framework, market-based approaches to regulation can provide carriers with the flexibility needed to comply with regulations while

maintaining an incentive to offer cost-effective, competitive service. In this spirit, the U.S. Department of Transportation has stated in its report to Congress on the functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission that a new regulatory approach has emerged in recent years, one which is "recognizing competition as the best regulator of transportation * * *." The Department therefore, has recommended removing various archaic Federal laws which are no longer applicable because of structural changes in the market for freight transportation.

Also, the Department encourages innovation through public-private financing partnerships to achieve greater efficiencies in both the private and public sectors. Cost-sharing and public-private partnership concepts provide new opportunities for the States to increase investment in needed transportation facilities and to work with the private sector to promote innovative solutions to transportation problems. The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) provides an example where the public and private sectors can work together to eliminate unnecessary cross-border barriers to trade.

Part II—Contemporary Issues

The above principles represent those values that we feel should be reflected in a freight policy. The remainder of this document discusses a series of topical issues in a manner which illustrates how many of the functional areas which the Department must address should be approached in the context of a comprehensive freight policy. They reflect a perspective that embraces highway system stewardship from both a facilities management and motor carrier operational perspective. The above principles are a starting point for the questions of governmental interest, generally, and the Federal interest, in particular.

1. Infrastructure—System Design and Investment

One of the strengths of the highway motor carrier transport mode is its inherent flexibility advantage and thus high service quality. New economic processes and arrangements place high value in the characteristics of reliability and security in addition to speed. The environment in which large vehicles operate is key to improving truck safety. Road design significantly affects truck accident rates. For example, the rate of fatal combination truck accidents on non-Interstate roads is significantly higher than the rate on Interstate roads. The interface between roadway

geometry and truck safety requires scrutiny when road design alternatives are considered or highway improvements are made.

A revolution in freight transportation is occurring as our domestic highway programs face a major crossroads. The completion of the Interstate System and designation of the NHS signal a new stage in our highway network. Due to demographic and economic changes throughout the United States, the Interstate System alone cannot adequately serve the needs of modern goods movement. The NHS is intended to concentrate Federal resources on those elements of the principal arterial system which are crucial to interstate and international commerce.

Much of the Nation's industrial capacity has moved from its northeastern urban origins to rural areas of the country. International manufacturing arrangements are growing in importance. With implementation of the NAFTA, the need for fast, reliable transportation connecting Mexico, the United States, and Canada will become even more vital. The NHS will be focused on and provide for the current and future national highway transportation needs such as those resulting from changing trade and traffic flows.

Improving the capacity, safety, and structural life of the NHS will facilitate U.S. international trade and growing domestic productivity through improved efficiencies in the movement of goods produced for and by U.S. businesses. With Federal input, State transportation plans and specific projects must ensure that the objectives of States and localities contribute to the NHS's goal of improved economic competitiveness through improved mobility.

Although the NHS will enhance the economic competitiveness of U.S. businesses by improving highway transportation, these gains will not be maximized unless the quality of connections among transportation modes is improved. The National Transportation System planning framework will help in the development of a smooth and seamless interchange among the transportation modes by highlighting for planners the important intermodal connections nationwide and identifying any impediments to the efficient movement of goods through these connections. This, in turn, will enhance the efficiency of freight carriers and the general economic performance nationally as transport costs decrease.

3. Intermodal Freight Planning

An important step in freight planning is to see the system as a whole—to understand freight movements as a system of supply chains and distribution networks. Since an important Departmental goal is to contribute to the Nation's economic performance, this implies the desire to select the most important movements to address, not just the best way to address them. This requires the identification of the needs of shippers with respect to infrastructure and/or freight operations.

As our concerns have matured to the perspective of total system management, six specific management systems (pavement, bridges, safety, traffic congestion, public transportation, and intermodal transportation facilities) and the traffic monitoring system have been identified that will provide information concerning both the condition and the performance of the existing and future transportation system.

Although no "freight management system" is specifically identified in the aforementioned list, freight transportation should be an important consideration within each of the management systems. The freight customer can be said to affect, and be affected by, all these systems. Freight consumers' perspectives can take on several dimensions, corresponding to the service provider/carrier, the shipper, and the ultimate consumer of the commodities (the value of which contains a transport component). Goods movement deserves significant treatment beginning with the inventories/descriptions of usage and systems. This should be followed up by evaluations of those systems as input to public decisionmaking to identify strategic freight investments.

Thus, determining transportation infrastructure needs for freight is as much a demand-side assessment as it is a supply-side one. An important element of system strategy is to determine the facility or operational change needed to fit the job. Designing a quality and cost-effective facility—that is, the supply side—comes after determining which services are the most needed.

3. Safety Analysis and Research

Truck accidents are frequently caused by errors of either truck drivers or drivers of other vehicles involved in collisions with trucks, rather than failures of vehicle components. Nevertheless, vehicle design and performance affects truck drivers' ability to respond to, or recover from, those errors. Additionally, safe highway

design and special safety features reduce the potential for accidents and the severity of accidents that occur. Therefore, a balanced program focused on optimizing driver, vehicle, and highway performance is warranted. Attention will be given to issues of human behavior, operator proficiency, emergency response, and training to reduce the influence that deficiencies in any factor may have on accidents. Additionally, efforts will be made to optimize vehicle collision avoidance and crashworthiness performance.

Understanding the factors that influence truck accident rates will lead to better, more informed freight policy decisions. Assessing the value of safety investments so that informed public decisions can be made requires that truck travel data, accident information, and the investment levels themselves be more comprehensive and accurate. Since a variety of factors affect the safe operation of trucks, a more comprehensive approach to data collection is needed. Factors such as the growth in truck travel, industry structure, traffic densities, and passenger and freight vehicle dimensions and weights are changing. Improved data is needed to better monitor both safety program performance and carrier performance.

More analysis and research on motor carrier safety is needed to identify changes in safety levels and the factors producing these changes, evaluate policies that may affect these factors, and target safety investments accordingly. The analysis must be coupled with research to answer questions on vehicle, roadway, and driver performance and develop new technologies that will improve motor carrier program effectiveness and efficiency.

4. Finance and Taxation

Publicly provided facilities and services for highway/motor carrier freight transportation are financed in whole or in part by user fees. The extent to which user fees assessed on each mode cover public costs varies widely. Several criteria are important in evaluating the level and structure of user fees, including:

1. To the maximum extent possible, user fees should cover appropriate costs of public infrastructure improvements and other public programs;
2. Users should contribute a proportionate share of their costs of facilities and services; and
3. Federal subsidies to one mode should not unfairly affect competition with other modes.

Federally-sponsored studies of freight user fees have been conducted for highways, airports, railroads, and waterways. These studies vary significantly in detail; comprehensive cost allocation studies have been conducted for highways and airways while more general studies have been conducted for the other modes. The last major Federal Highway Cost Allocation Study in 1982 showed that heavy trucks paid substantially less in Federal user fees than their estimated Federal highway cost responsibility. User fee adjustments were made in 1982 and 1984 to partially address study findings. However, recent increases in the fuel tax have likely changed the equity of the overall user fee structure. Also, the ISTEA changed the Federal program structure, system responsibility, and flexibility in the use of funds, which would likely change cost responsibility among users. A new Federal cost allocation study is underway to evaluate implications of these and other prospective changes in highway or intermodal programs.

5. Truck Size and Weight (TS&W) Policy

The question of appropriate size and weight limits for trucks has always been a difficult one. It conjures up images of "grandfather rights" from the Interstate era, conflicting views of proper State-Federal relationships, rival economic interests, and uncertainty as to the operational safety of various types of trucks.

The TS&W issues are extremely complex; they relate not only to questions of highway safety and stewardship but to local, State, and national economic performance. At a time when transportation is becoming a larger part of the goods *production* as well as distribution systems, the effects of additional regulation on productivity take on renewed significance.

The macroeconomic impacts of change to these regulations are initially private ones: equipment costs; fuel consumption; and personnel expenditures. The direct costs imposed, if not counterbalanced, are public ones: pavement and bridge deterioration; and safety consequences. However, changing trucking productivity quickly translates to changes in costs and efficiency for shippers, the economy as a whole and, thus, the consuming public.

Extended fact-finding and debate are necessary to do justice to TS&W issues. Good TS&W policy helps ensure safe and efficient freight movement on our Nation's highway and intermodal systems. Beyond the general freight principles which began this document,

changes at this juncture should also, to the extent possible, address:

1. Highway and vehicle safety through a performance based regulatory approach;

2. Efficient interstate and international commerce through advanced highway and vehicle technologies;

3. Streamlined, uniform, and enforceable administrative procedures and requirements for permitting and taxation purposes;

4. Compatible vehicle and infrastructure design; and

5. Equitable recovery of public costs.

The TS&W policies directly influence truck designs and configurations. Choices made in this regard by motor carriers and truck designers, in response to size and weight constraints, affect not only the amount of weight carried by a truck and the effect that weight has on highway infrastructure, but also the braking and handling and stability properties of the vehicle. Vehicle size and weight policies should be structured to encourage and ensure vehicle designs and configurations that are optimized relative to all these concerns.

The TS&W policy and highway user fee issues are virtually inseparable. Pavement and bridge costs attributable to heavy vehicles will rise (or fall) as the result of size and weight policy changes. Significant changes in size and weight limits should not be considered without evaluating appropriate motor carrier user fees. Fines and other penalties have proven to be ineffective deterrents to overweight operations because they are too low to offset potential profits from operating overweight. This is borne out by Federal estimates that show 10 to 20 percent of all combinations operate illegally overweight. State permit fees for overweight operations generally are too low to cover added pavement and bridge costs associated with the overweight operations. States that issue overweight and oversize permits should consider setting permit fees at levels that reflect added highway costs of overweight operations to improve the effectiveness of their TS&W enforcement efforts.

In an effort to better understand the effects of TS&W policy changes on these many factors, the Department has undertaken a comprehensive TS&W study to examine the relationship between TS&W policy and safety, pavement and bridge condition, shipper logistics, truck operating costs, intermodal operation, and energy and environmental concerns, to evaluate the appropriate scope and extent of Federal involvement. The FHWA published a

notice in the **Federal Register** on February 2, 1995, announcing the study and soliciting comments (60 FR 6587).

Regarding international commerce, wide disparity between the standards across the United States, Mexico, and Canada (as well as those across our States) often inhibit the efficient flow of continental trade. In a NAFTA context, the Department is committed to finding a means, in consultation with Congress, to make TS&W and safety standards compatible. Further, significant growth in international container traffic, combined with varying international TS&W standards, has created enforcement and economic efficiency concerns.

6. Highway Freight Transportation and Air Quality

With the passage of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 and the subsequent Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) for California in 1994, concerns have been raised as to the effects that air quality regulations may have on freight transportation in the near future, especially in California. While air quality improvement is an important public policy objective, it is important to remember that there are typically multiple objectives and implications in all major public policy decisions, and these must be balanced. For instance, the original FIP issued on May 5, 1994, contained several proposals which it was thought might significantly impact the freight industries, and hence regional and national economic performance. Since that time, the FIP has been revised, based on public comment, to more effectively balance the national objectives of improving air quality and maintaining economic competitiveness. The currently proposed standard of 2.0 g/bhp-hr (grams per brake-horsepower-hour) for nitrogen oxide emissions and the implementation time frame is considered more feasible by industry.

Freight concerns are likely to play a more prominent role in other State Implementation Plans now being considered. Recognizing these concerns, the Environmental Protection Agency recently set up a government and industry task force to look at various freight and air quality issues.

Authority: 23 U.S.C. 315; 49 U.S.C. 301, 302, 305; Pub. L. 102-548, 106 Stat. 3646.

Issued on: August 21, 1995.

Rodney E. Slater,

Federal Highway Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95-21305 Filed 8-25-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-P

Federal Railroad Administration

Fiscal Year 1995 Railroad User Fee Calculations

AGENCY: Federal Railroad Administration; Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Railroad Administration is today publishing its fiscal year 1995 assessment rates supporting the collection of railroad user fees.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Vicky McCully, Railroad User Fee Officer, Federal Railroad Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC. 20590; telephone (202) 366-6569.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In its regulations implementing the Railroad User Fee provisions of section 20115 of Title 49, United States Code (formerly section 216 of the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 (see 49 CFR 245.301(a)), the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) indicated that it would publish a notice each year in the **Federal Register** identifying FRA's calculations of the total railroad user fee to be collected for the fiscal year, the assessment rate per train mile, the assessment rate per employee hour, and the assessment rate per road mile (as adjusted by the sliding scale).

For fiscal year 1995, user fee assessments totaling \$40,584,892 are based on 658,208,164 total industry train miles; 150,820 total industry road miles; and 518,612,773 total industry employee hours.

The base assessment rate per road mile is \$93.99, with applicable adjustments for the sliding scale as follows:

Train mile/road mile ratio	SF ¹	RM rate ²
1201 and above	1.00	\$113.39
1001 to 1200	0.75	70.49
751 to 1,000	0.50	46.99
501 to 750	0.25	23.50
Up to 500	0.00	0.00

¹ SF refers to scaling factor.

² RM Rate refers to Road Mile Rate.

The assessment rate per train mile is \$.033842. The assessment rate per employee hour is \$.007809.

Issued in Washington, DC on August 22, 1995.

Donald M. Itzkoff,

Deputy Federal Railroad Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95-21306 Filed 8-25-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-06-P