above-numbered declaration is hereby amended to establish the incident period for this disaster as beginning on January 26, 1996 and continuing through February 23, 1996.

All other information remains the same, i.e., the termination date for filing applications for physical damage is April 11, 1996, and for loans for economic injury the deadline is November 12, 1996.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 59002 and 59008.)

Dated: March 26, 1996.

Herbert L. Mitchell,

*Acting Associate Administrator for Disaster Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 96–8350 Filed 4–3–96; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8025–01–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

**[Docket No. 37554]**

### Notice of Order Adjusting the Standard Foreign Fare Level Index

Section 41509(e) of Title 49 of the United States Code requires that the Department, as successor to the Civil Aeronautics Board, establish a Standard Foreign Fare Level (SFFL) by adjusting the SFFL base periodically by percentage changes in actual operating costs per available seat-mile (ASM). Order 80–2–69 established the first interim SFFL, and Order 96–2–11 established the currently effective two-month SFFL applicable through March 31, 1996.

In establishing the SFFL for the two-month period beginning April 1, 1996, we have projected non-fuel costs based on the year ended December 31, 1995 data, and have determined fuel prices on the basis of the latest available experienced monthly fuel cost levels as reported to the Department.

By Order 96–3–61 fares may be increased by the following adjustment factors over the October 1979 level:

Atlantic—1.4368

Latin America—1.5211

Pacific-1.4879

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Keith A. Shangraw (202) 366–2439.

By the Department of Transportation:
Dated: April 1, 1996.

Patrick v. Murphy

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs.*

[FR Doc. 96–8336 Filed 4–3–96; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–62–P**

### Coast Guard

**[CGD 96–015]**

### Tug-of-Opportunity System Plan for the Olympic Coast Marine Sanctuary and the Strait of Juan de Fuca

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of inquiry.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard seeks information that may be useful in preparing a plan to be submitted to Congress on the most cost-effective means of implementing an international private-sector tug-of-opportunity system to provide timely response to a vessel in distress transiting the waters within the boundaries of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary or the Strait of Juan de Fuca. This plan is mandated by Section 401 of the Alaska Power Administration Asset Sale and Termination Act.

**DATES:** Comments are requested by June 3, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be mailed to the Executive Secretary, Marine Safety Council (G–LRA/3406), U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, DC 20593–0001, or may be delivered to room 3406 at the same address between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is (202) 267–1477. The Executive Secretary maintains the public docket for this notice. Comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at room 3406, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Commander William Carey, Commander (mep), Thirteenth Coast Guard District, 915 Second Avenue, Seattle, WA 98174–1067, (206) 220–7221.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### Request for Information

The Coast Guard encourages interested persons to participate in this request for comments by submitting written data, views or arguments. Persons submitting comments should include their names and addresses, identify this notice [CGD 96–015] and the specific section or question of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit two copies of all comments and attachments in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. Persons wanting acknowledgment of receipt of comments should enclose stamped, self-addressed postcards or envelopes. The Coast Guard will consider all comments received during the comment period.

Drafting Information: The principal persons involved in drafting this document are Commander William Carey, Project Manager, Thirteenth Coast Guard District, Marine Safety Division and Lieutenant Laticia Argenti, Project Counsel, Thirteenth Coast Guard District, Legal Office.

#### Background and Purpose

On November 28, 1995, the President signed the Alaska Power Administration Asset Sale and Termination Act (Pub. L. 104–58), authorizing exports of Alaskan North Slope (ANS) crude oil when transported in U.S. flag tankers. Section 401 of the statute directs the Coast Guard to submit within 15 months of enactment of the Act, a plan to Congress on the most cost-effective means of implementing an international private-sector tug-of-opportunity system. The plan is to include a coordinated system of communication, using existing towing vessels to provide timely emergency response to a vessel in distress transiting the waters within the boundaries of the Olympic Coast Marine Sanctuary or the Strait of Juan de Fuca.

#### Specific Comments Requested

To ensure that the Coast Guard provides to Congress the most cost-effective plan for implementing an international private-sector tug-of-opportunity system, the Coast Guard needs more information. The Coast Guard is particularly interested in receiving information, views, and data on the following questions and areas of concern:

1. What topics should the plan address?
2. How might a private sector tug-of-opportunity system be implemented and operated? What private sector entity would be best suited to administer a tug-of-opportunity system?
3. What are the historical and current volumes and types of traffic transiting through the area of concern? What are the projections for traffic in future years?
4. What are the numbers and types (ship particulars, horsepower, bollard pull, etc.) of tugs operating in the area of concern?
5. What are the costs for tugs of varying capability?
6. What are the various cost components of a tug-of-opportunity system?
7. How might the private sector allocate the system costs among the various users? Should costs be passed on to ship operators on a operator by operator basis, voyage basis, risk basis or some combination of these or other factors?