6. Have changes in vetting and other management practices been instituted since the passage of OPA 90? Have these changes been made as a direct result of section 4115 of OPA 90? What impact have these changes had on ship safety and the reduction of pollution into the marine environment?

7. What is your experience with the operational safety of double hull tank vessels in regard to stability during loading and discharge, safe access to ballast spaces, ventilation of ballast spaces, salvage, and other safety issues?

8. What is your inspection and maintenance experience in regard to corrosion protection and structural performance of double hull tank vessels?

9. Have you had any structural problems on double hull tank vessels?

10. What design changes would you suggest in double hull tank vessels?

11. Based on your experience, what are the advantages and disadvantages of double hull tank vessels as compared to single hull tank vessels?

12. Has OPA 90, section 4115, forced the retirement of single hull tank vessels earlier than desired or expected? If so, how much earlier and for what specific reason?

13. How do maintenance and operating costs differ between double hull and single hull tankers? Are higher costs anticipated for maintaining internal tank coatings? Manning and training requirements? Insurance? Drydocking and other maintenance and repair costs?

14. To what extent will pre-MARPOL tankers be modified to meet MARPOL's requirements for protectively located/segregated ballast tanks in order to gain additional life in the Regulation 13G retirement schedule?

15. Will MARPOL tankers in the international trade operate for the full 30 year limit or retire early? If they retire early, how much earlier?

16. Has the phase-out schedule for single hull tankers in OPA 90 affected the ability of shipping companies to finance replacement vessels? If so, how?

17. Has a two-tiered market developed in which double hull tank vessels receive higher freight rates than single hull tank vessels? If so, what is the difference? If not, will such a two-tiered market develop in the future?

18. To what extent will existing tank vessels without double hulls be reconstructed to comply with the double hull requirements of OPA 90 section 4115? At what cost? (Jones Act and international trades.)

19. Coast Guard lightering regulations permit the use of certain single hull vessels in specified lightering zones within U.S. territorial waters until 2015, five years beyond the mandated double hull conversion schedule of OPA 90, section 4115. What is the potential impact of the lightering regulations on the use of single hull vessels in U.S. waters?

Dated: April 18, 1996.

Joseph J. Angelo,

Director for Standards, Marine Safety and Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 96–10256 Filed 4–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Availability, Final Environmental Impact Statement; Master Plan Update, Syracuse-Hancock International Airport, Syracuse, New York

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration.

The City of Syracuse, Department of Aviation, owner and operator of Syracuse-Hancock International Airport, has prepared a Master Plan update for the airport. As part of the Plan, it was determined that a runway parallel to Runway 10–28 would be needed to accommodate the anticipated aviation demand and to allow for necessary temporary closures to existing Runway 10–28. The proposed project is the acquisition of approximately 220 acres of land located primarily northeast of the airport to provide a site for the construction of Runway 10L–28R parallel to, 3,600 ft. north of, and 1,400 ft. east of existing Runway 10–28.

A Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) has been prepared by the FAA and the City of Syracuse which assesses the impact of alternative airport improvements. In the first phase of development, a runway 7,500 ft. long and 150 ft. wide would be constructed. In the second phase of development, the runway would be extended to an ultimate length of 9,000 ft. The 3,600 ft. lateral separation between the parallel runways would provide the capability to accommodate dual simultaneous ILS approaches to these runways.

Copies of the FEIS are available for review at the following locations:

Federal Aviation Administration, Airports Division, Regional Office, Fitzgerald Federal Building, JFK Int'l Airport, Jamaica, NY 11430. FAA Contact person is Mr. Frank Squeglia, Environmental Specialist (718) 553–3325.

City of Syracuse, Department of Aviation, Syracuse-Hancock International Airport, Main Terminal Building, 2nd Floor Syracuse, New York 13212. City Contact person is Mr. Charles Everett, Jr., Commissioner (315) 454–3263.

Town of Clay, Zoning Dept., 4483 Route 31, Clay, New York 13041.

Town of Cicero, Zoning Dept., 8326 S. Main St., Cicero, New York 13039.

Town of Dewitt, Zoning Dept., 5400 Butternut Dr., Dewitt, New York 13214.

Town of Salina, Zoning Dept., 201 School Rd., Liverpool, New York 13088.

Syracuse University, Byrd Library, 222 Waverly Ave., Syracuse, New York 13210.

Onondaga Co. Public Library, 447 S. Salina St., Galleries Mall, Syracuse, New York 13202.

Comments on the FEIS must be received within 30 days from the publication date of this Notice and addressed to both the FAA and City of Syracuse at the above addresses. All substantive comments will be considered in the FAA Record of Decision (ROD) which will conclude the environmental process for this Federal action.

Issued in Jamaica, New York on April 12, 1996.

Anthony P. Spera,

Acting Manager, Airports Division, Federal Aviation Administration, Eastern Region.

[FR Doc. 96–9961 Filed 4–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Office of the Secretary of Transportation

[Docket No. OST–96–1288]

Comprehensive Truck Size and Weight Study: Analytical Framework and Outreach Plan

AGENCY: Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary (OST).

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This notice provides an update on the options analysis framework approved by the DOT Policy Oversight Group for the DOT Comprehensive TS&W Study and requests comments on this framework. Plans are outlined for informational focus sessions to explain how the study is being conducted and to obtain direct comment from constituent groups.

DATES: To be timely for consideration for either the analytical framework or outreach plans for the study, comments should be received on or before May 28, 1996. However, this docket will remain open until the study is completed. FHWA Docket No. 95–5 also will

remain open until completion of the study.

ADDRESSES: Submit written, signed comments to Docket No. OST–96–1288, the Docket Clerk, U.S. Department of Transportation, Room PL–401, C–55, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590. All comments received will be available for examination at the above address between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., ET, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Those desiring notification of receipt of comments must include a self-addressed, stamped envelope or postcard.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Cynthia Elliot, Office of Policy Development, FHWA, at (202) 366–8707; Mr. Carl Swerdloff, Office of Economics, Office of the Secretary, DOT, at (202) 366–5427; Ms. Jill Hochman, Office of Motor Carrier Information Analysis, at (202) 366–1861; or Mr. Charles Medalen, Office of Chief Counsel, at (202) 366–1354, FHWA, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590. Office hours are from 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In June 1995, the Secretary established the Policy Oversight Group (POG), chaired by Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy, Frank E. Kruesi, to ensure major decisions guiding the Comprehensive Truck Size and Weight (TS&W) Study would be made on an intermodal basis and to coordinate the TS&W Study with the Highway Cost Allocation Study. The POG includes policy level representatives from the offices of the Associate Deputy Secretary and Director of the Office of Intermodalism, the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs, and the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs, FHWA, Federal Railroad Administration, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Maritime Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and Bureau of Transportation Statistics (see August, 30, 1995 Federal Register). After extensive review and discussion, the POG has formulated and approved an options analysis framework for the TS&W Study consisting of three parts: technical building blocks, policy approaches, and illustrative scenarios. For further information on the Comprehensive Truck Size and Weight Study, please refer to the February 2, 1995 and August 30, 1995 Federal Register notices and submissions to FHWA Docket No. 95–5. For information on the Highway Cost Allocation Study, please refer to the February 10, 1995 Federal Register notice and to submissions to FHWA Docket No. 95–6.

This analytical framework is designed as a structure for gathering information, such as safety, environmental, economic, traffic operations, modal diversion, and bridge and pavement impacts, about significant truck configurations that have been suggested in previous studies (including the ''Report of the Subcommittee on Truck Size and Weight of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Joint Committee on Domestic Freight Policy'' (AASHTO, June, 1995), ''Truck Weight Limits'' (Transportation Research Board (TRB), 1990), ''New Trucks for Greater Productivity and Less Road Wear, an Evaluation of the Turner Proposal'' (TRB, 1990), and ''Longer Combination Vehicle Operations in Western States'' (DOT, 1986)), or may emerge in the current policy environment. The framework is conceived as a flexible tool for examining the wide range of TS&W options, from more restrictive to more liberal, that may receive legislative consideration now or in the future. With periodic updates in data or methodologies, this framework will ensure that the Department can respond to significant TS&W proposals without embarking on a separate, new study for each proposal. Public comment on this framework is invited.

Building Blocks

Technical building blocks analyzing a broad range of truck configurations at varying gross vehicle weights provide the foundation for the analytical framework. These configurations include three- and four-axle single unit trucks, five- and six-axle semitrailers, 28-foot doubles, intermediate length (31- to 33-foot) doubles, and longer combination vehicles. An evaluation will be conducted for each configuration in relation to various highway system(s)—the Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways (Interstate System), the National Network (NN) for trucks, the National Highway System (NHS), and a limited system of highways tailored for the operation of longer combination vehicles—on which the configuration operates now or might be proposed to operate. Operations of each configuration also will be examined, as appropriate, in relation to major geographic considerations for that configuration—national, regional, and state. In addition, configurations will be analyzed at operating weights which vary according to different assumptions about axle weight and bridge formula restrictions. These analytical building blocks are represented in the matrix below:

TS&W ANALYTICAL BUILDING BLOCKS BY CONFIGURATION, SYSTEM, AND GEOGRAPHY

Configuration	Maximum gross weight range (in pounds)	Highway system				Geography		
		Interstate system	National network	National highway system	Limited* systems for LCV's	National	Regional	State
Single Unit Truck	54,000–68,000	X	X	X	.....	.....	X	X
Semitrailer	80,000–97,000	X	X	X	.....	X	X	X
Double 28 to 28½ ft. Trailer	80,000–111,000	X	X	X	.....	X	X	X
Intermediate Length (31–33 ft.) Double	105,500–128,000	X	.....	X	.....	X	X	.....
Longer Combination Vehicles	105,500–148,000	.....	.....	.....	X	X	X	.....

*Highways on which LCV's currently operate or might be proposed to operate.

Evaluation of possible regulations pertaining to a variety of configurations, such as elimination of grandfather provisions, freezing weight limits on the NHS, limiting trailer and semitrailer lengths to 53 feet, and lifting the longer combination vehicle freeze also will be examined.

The inclusion of a configuration at a gross vehicle weight limit or on a certain network in the building blocks for analysis does not imply a predisposition of the DOT to its adoption. In response to Congressional direction to conduct a thorough and

comprehensive study, a wide range of configurations are being evaluated to understand the impacts of keeping their operations strictly at current limits as well as restricting or expanding their operations. As a result of the study, if the Department makes recommendations for changes in truck size and weight limitations, such recommendations would be submitted to Congress for legislative consideration.

Policy Analysis

A Notice of Proposed Policy for a Freight Policy Statement setting forth a policy context for important decisions affecting freight transportation across all modes was published in the Federal Register on April 2, 1996. The second part of the TS&W analytical framework will focus directly on such major policy considerations. DOT's draft Freight Policy Statement presents important principles for all freight-related decisionmaking which must be applied to the TS&W context. The POG will be establishing impact measures for the study derived from the Freight Policy Statement, and these will be used in the Policy Analysis section of the overall analytical framework.

In addition, the TS&W study will examine Federal and state role issues; important international concerns, such as overweight container movements; and potential alternative regulatory approaches. At least four policy approaches will receive extensive study: (1) the implications of the existing TS&W regulatory regime; (2) implications of expanding Federal controls on the NHS; (3) issues involved in increased state authority in TS&W regulation, and (4) international considerations affecting TS&W.

Illustrative Options

When all the information required by the building block and policy analysis is developed, the study will examine a few initial scenarios to demonstrate how the full analysis framework is applied. Within each broad policy approach noted above, the POG has selected one or two illustrative scenarios for full analysis in order to demonstrate their full range of impacts and associated costs and benefits. The scenarios selected by the POG for full analysis are not DOT recommendations, but do illustrate proposals to which DOT might be asked to respond in the future. Because the TS&W analytical framework is flexible and includes many building blocks, other scenarios could be fully analyzed in the future as well.

Illustrative scenarios selected for complete analysis include the following:

1. Status Quo. This scenario serves as a baseline for other scenarios and retains all features of current law, including the ISTEA freeze. Federal size limits (102-inch maximum vehicle width, 48-foot minimum semitrailer length, and 28-foot minimum trailer length for double-trailer combinations) remain on Interstate and designated highways (the National Network). The size limits would not apply to NHS highways not already designated as NN highways under the STAA of 1982. Federal weight limits (20,000-pound single- and 34,000-pound tandem-axle limits, 80,000-pound cap, and Bridge Formula B) remain on Interstate highways as do existing grandfather rights. Operation of LCV's (any combination of a truck tractor or semitrailers carrying more than 80,000 pounds) on the Interstate Highway System are restricted to what was in use as of June 1, 1991. Operation of commercial motor vehicle combinations with two or more cargo-carrying units on the NN is restricted to what was in use on June 1, 1991, subject to state restrictions on that date.

2. Expanded Federal Control of TS&W on the NHS. This approach focuses on a special Federal role on the NHS in recognition of its importance for interstate and international commerce. The following scenarios would be examined in detail:

a. Restrict weights on non-Interstate portions of the NHS to Federal limits but grandfather currently higher state weight limits on the NHS, and (2) restrict semitrailer lengths on the NHS to a maximum of 53 feet but grandfather operation of existing semitrailers greater than 53 feet in length on the NHS where they may now legally operate.

b. Extend Federal STAA size limits (102-inch maximum vehicle width, 48-foot minimum semitrailer length, and 28-foot minimum trailer length for double-trailer combinations) to the entire NHS. No state could exclude such vehicles from the NHS. The 80,000 pound GVW limit would remain in place on the Interstate System except where higher limits have been grandfathered.

3. Increasing State Flexibility. This approach would increase state flexibility in controlling truck size and weight on all highway systems. The following illustrative scenarios would be evaluated in detail:

a. Lift the Longer Combination Vehicle freeze which restricts the operation of LCV's on the Interstate and NN highway systems to those that were in use on or before June 1, 1991. All other Federal size and weight controls would remain. Included in the analysis are two different assumptions: (1) states retain authority to determine the extent of grandfather rights, and (2) grandfather authority is determined at the Federal level.

b. Replace grandfather provisions with federally regulated, state voluntary permit programs for operation of combinations over 80,000 lbs. GVW. Federal safety and infrastructure standards for operation of these vehicles would be established. Federal axle and bridge controls would remain.

4. International Considerations. This approach focuses on continuing concern about overweight international container movements. DOT would evaluate one scenario in which states would be required to allow use of a six-axle tractor-semitrailer combination at a gross weight limit of 97,000 pounds (for this configuration only). This scenario assumes establishing axle weight limits to avoid over-stressing bridges and establishing minimum Federal safety standards for operation of these vehicles. Two alternative systems would be examined requiring states to allow this vehicle on: (1) the Interstate System only, and (2) the entire NHS.

Outreach

Two public meetings to obtain comment on the TS&W Study were held in Denver, Colorado, and Washington, D.C., in the spring of 1995. Since that time, public outreach has been conducted through requests for comment in the Federal Register and on an informal basis with the most readily identifiable members of TS&W constituent communities. Public contact has included open, informal technical briefings, meetings with national and regional interest groups, and Congressional briefings. To complement these efforts and ensure better understanding of the many technical and innovative elements of DOT's TS&W study activities, DOT will conduct four regional TS&W focus sessions. These informational focus sessions will highlight the wide range of efforts encompassed in the study and provide for greater public input. They will be aimed at reaching major constituencies and experts across the nation who have knowledge of these issues and will present information on major TS&W study elements and the options analytical framework. Focus sessions now are being planned for four geographically diverse cities. These sessions will be kept to a relatively small size to facilitate discussion and information exchange, although there will be some limited capacity to accommodate others who wish to attend.

In addition, DOT will continue to hold open, informal technical briefings by specialists directly working on specific segments of the TS&W effort. DOT has held three such briefings—on preliminary results of Truck Inventory and Use Survey analysis, on intermodal diversion analysis and on domestic and international freight trends. Individuals attending these briefings have indicated that they gain useful insight into the methodologies being used in the study and that the briefings provide an opportunity to get detailed answers to their questions.

DOT also will make available executive summaries of individual study reports as they are completed and brief written updates on progress of the study. Parties interested in being placed on a mailing list for technical briefing announcements, executive summaries, and periodic updates should provide their name and address to any of the DOT contacts noted above. Distribution of TS&W study report summaries and updates over the Internet also are being planned. DOT will continue to provide updates on its TS&W study at meetings and conferences held by government, safety, industry, research, and other groups as requested.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on April 19, 1996.

Frank E. Kruesi,

Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy.

[FR Doc. 96–10278 Filed 4–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–62–P

Federal Aviation Administration

RTCA, Inc.; Technical Management Committee

Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (P.L. 92–463, 5 U.S.C., Appendix 2), notice is hereby given for the RTCA Technical Management Committee meeting to be held May 10, 1996, starting at 9:00 a.m. The meeting will be held at RTCA, Inc., 1140 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1020, Washington, DC, 20036.

The agenda will include: (1) Chairman's Remarks; (2) Review and Approval of Summary of the Previous Meeting; (3) Systems Management Working Group Report to the Technical Management Committee; (4) Consider and Approve: a. RTCA course of action concerning activities relating to EUROCAE Working Group 52; b. Course of action concerning white paper on required system performance; c. Terms of reference and chairman for new special committee concerned with developing FANS systems requirements and objectives; (5) Take Action on Open Items from Previous Meeting; (6) Other Business; (7) Date and Place of Next Meeting.

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability. With the approval of the chairman, members of the public may present oral statements or obtain information should contact the RTCA Secretariat, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1020, Washington, D.C. 20036; (202) 833–9339 (phone) or (202) 833–9434 (fax). Members of the public may present a written statement to the committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on April 19, 1996.

Janice L. Peters,

Designated Official.

[FR Doc. 96–10123 Filed 4–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

RTCA, Inc.; Special Committee 187; Mode Select Beacon and Data Link System

Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (P.L. 92–463, 5 U.S.C., Appendix 2), notice is hereby given for Special Committee 187 meeting to be held on May 14, 1996, starting at 9:00 a.m. The meeting will be held at RTCA, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1020, Washington, DC 20036.

The agenda will be as follows: (1) Introductory Remarks; (2) Review and Approval of the Agenda; (3) Review and Approval of the Summary of the Previous Meeting; (4) Complete the Review of Change 2 to RTCA/DO–181A; (5) Detailed Review of Change 1 to RTCA/DO–218; (6) Other Business; (7) Date and Place of Next Meeting.

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability. With the approval of the chairman, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present statements or obtain information should contact the RTCA Secretariat, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1020, Washington, D.C. 20036; (202) 833–9339 (phone) or (202) 833–9434 (fax). Members of the public may present a written statement to the committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on April 19, 1996.

Janice L. Peters,

Designated Official.

[FR Doc. 96–10124 Filed 4–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Maritime Administration

[Docket S–936]

BSTC Holding Inc.; Notice of Application To Transfer Operating-Differential Subsidy Agreement, Contract MA/MSB–439 to BSTC Holding Inc.

Notice is hereby given that BSTC Holding Inc. (Applicant) applies under sections 605(c) and 608 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Act), for financial aid in the operation of vessels which are to be used in an essential service in the foreign commerce of the United States through approval of the transfer to the Applicant of Operating-Differential Subsidy Agreement (ODSA), Contract MA/MSB–439.

The Applicant is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Atlantic Maritime, Ltd. (Atlantic). Atlantic was the winning bidder at bankruptcy for the U.S.-built, U.S.-flag tanker, the FALCON LEADER. Closing on the purchase of the FALCON LEADER is currently pending. Boston Shipping & Trading, an affiliated company of the Applicant, will own the FALCON LEADER.

On March 11, 1996, Atlantic entered into an agreement to purchase ODSA, Contract MA/MSB–439 from the estates of Equity Carriers I, Inc., Equity Carriers III, Inc., and Asco-Falcon II Shipping Company (the Estates).

ODSA, Contract MA/MSB–439 provided an operating-differential subsidy (ODS) for each of three MA Design C5–M–129 dry bulk cargo vessels. ODSA, Contract MA/MSB–439 expires on May 23, 2001.

On April 9, 1996, Atlantic assigned its rights under the agreement to purchase ODSA, Contract MA/MSB–439 to the Applicant. The Applicant proposes to use the ODS provided in the ODSA to engage the FALCON LEADER in an essential service in the foreign commerce of the United States. The Applicant does not charter or operate vessels other than the proposed chartering of the FALCON LEADER. The Applicant is currently in search of two additional vessels documented in the United States that would be suitable to receive ODS under the ODSA. This application will be amended when and if the Applicant identifies such existing vessels. If the Applicant is not able to identify two such existing suitable vessels, the Applicant will seek permission to utilize the ODS for two newly constructed or acquired vessels to be subsequently identified.

The Applicant currently intends to offer the FALCON LEADER for charter on the spot and term market in the Caribbean to U.S. east coast oil product