is not a determination concerning the acceptability of land uses under Federal, state, or local law. Approval does not by itself constitute an FAA implementing action. A request for Federal action or approval to implement specific noise compatibility measures may be required, and an FAA decision on the request may require an environmental assessment of the proposed action. Approval does not constitute a commitment by the FAA to financially assist in the implementation of the program nor a determination that all measures covered by the program are eligible for grant-in-aid funding from the FAA. Where Federal funding is sought, requests for project grants must be submitted to the FAA Airports District Office in Seattle, Washington.

Snohomish County Airport submitted to the FAA the noise exposure maps, descriptions, and other documentation produced during the noise compatibility planning study conducted at Snohomish County Airport. The Snohomish County Airport noise exposure maps were determined by FAA to be in compliance with applicable requirements on April 5, 1996. Notice of this determination was published in the Federal Register on April 15, 1996.

The Snohomish County Airport noise compatibility program contains a proposed noise compatibility program comprised of actions designed for phased implementation by airport management and adjacent jurisdictions from the date of study completion to the year 2000. It was requested that the FAA evaluate and approve this material as a noise compatibility program as described in Section 104(b) of the Act. The FAA began its review of the program on April 5, 1996, and was required by a provision of the Act of approve or disapprove the program within 180 days (other than the use of new flight procedures for noise control). Failure to approve or disapprove such program within the 180-day period shall be deemed to be an approval of such program.

The submitted program contained 7 proposed actions for noise mitigation on and off the airport. The FAA completed its review and determined that the procedural and substantive requirements of the Act and FAR 150 have been satisfied. The overall program, therefore, was approved by the Associate Administrator for Airports effective October 2, 1996. Outright approval was granted for all program elements.

These determinations are set forth in detail in a Record of Approval endorsed by the Associate Administrator for Airports on October 2, 1996. The Record of Approval, as well as other evaluation materials and the documents comprising the submittal, are available for review at the FAA office listed above and at the administrative offices of the Snohomish County Airport.

Issued in Renton, Washington on October 17, 1996.

Lowell H. Johnson,

Manager, Airports Division, Northwest Mountain Region.

[FR Doc. 96–28664 Filed 11–6–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Maritime Administration

[Docket No. MSP–001]

Crowley American Transport, Inc.; Notice of Application Pursuant to Section 656 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as Amended

Crowley American Transport, Inc. (Crowley), by application received October 16, 1996, and supplemented October 30, 1996 applied under Section 651, Subtitle B, of the Act for participation in the Maritime Security Program (MSP). In support of its application Crowley submitted information pertaining to its level of noncontiguous domestic trade service as required by section 656 of the Act. Applicants which wish to receive MSP payments must describe their level of noncontiguous domestic service as provided for in section 656. Pursuant to section 656 of the Act, the Maritime Administration must determine Crowley's level of noncontiguous domestic trade service should it become party to a MSP operating agreement.

Crowley certified that its list of unscheduled tug and barge service provided in support of its application listed all the equipment for service between points in Alaska south of the Artic Circle and points in the contiguous 48 States, dedicated and actually utilized in that service in the two-year period preceding July 1, 1992. In addition, Crowley stated that service between San Juan and the U.S. Gulf was for the one-year period preceding August 9, 1995. Crowley's submittal of noncontiguous domestic trade service (Table I) as well as its affiliate, Crowley Marine Services, Inc. (Table II) was provided.

TABLE I.—CROWLEY AMERICAN TRANSPORT, INC., NONCONTIGUOUS TRADE—PUERTO RICO

Barge vessel *	TEU capacity	Voyages	Itinerary
EL CONQUISTADOR	796	16	Lake Charles-San Juan.
		7	Jacksonville-San Juan.
EL REY	796	30	Jacksonville-San Juan.
FORTALEZA	1,024	26	Jacksonville-San Juan.
		3	Petty's Is., NJ-San Juan.
JACKSONVILLE	1,024	23	Jacksonville-San Juan.
		3	Petty's Is., NJ-San Juan.
LA PRINCESA	796	18	Jacksonville-San Juan.
		9	Lake Charles-San Juan.
LA REINA	796	20	Lakes Charles-San Juan.
		2	Jacksonville-San Juan.
MIAMI	1,024	18	Petty's Is., NJ-San Juan.
		7	Jacksonville-San Juan.
PONCE	1,024	19	Petty's Is., NJ-San Juan.
		7	Jacksonville-San Juan.
SAN JUAN	1,024	20	Jacksonville-San Juan.
		8	Petty's Is., NJ-San Juan.
SANTO DOMINGO	235	2	Jacksonville-San Juan.

TABLE I.—CROWLEY AMERICAN TRANSPORT, INC., NONCONTIGUOUS TRADE—PUERTO RICO—Continued

Barge vessel *	TEU capacity	Voyages	Itinerary
BARGE 409	208	4	Jacksonville-San Juan.
		2	Lake Charles-San Juan.
		1	Petty's Is., NJ-San Juan.
BARGE 417	208	2	Jacksonville-San Juan.
BARGES 500–1 & 500–3	As provided by the grandfather provision of the Maritime Security Act, Section 4(h)(1)(A), allowing two barges each of 185 trailers and 100 automobiles, the Barges 500–1 and 500–3 have operated in each of these itineraries, since August 9, 1995.		

* All the named barges are accompanied by a tugboat for propulsion.

TABLE II.—CROWLEY MARINE SERVICES, INC. (AN AFFILIATED COMPANY OF APPLICANT)

Barge Vessel*	Voyages	Capacity							Itinerary
		DWT	TEU	CUBE	S. Ton	BBL	Trailer	Ratio	
Scheduled Tug and Barge Service									
BARGE 250–6	1	12,500	.....	42,500	3,000	.....	.....	.....	Seatt.-Capt. Bay, Nyknek, Dill, Bethel.
BARGE 410	1	12,500	.....	42,500	5,500	.....	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nak, Capt. Bay, Dill, Bethel, Nome.
BARGE MCKINLEY	1	9,100	.....	32,300	4,500	.....	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nak, Kotz, Dill, Bethel, Nome.
BARGE 400	1	12,500	.....	42,500	5,500	.....	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nak, Kotz, Lower Yukon.
BARGE 417	1	12,500	.....	42,500	5,500	.....	.....	.....	Seatt.-Naknet, Dill, Bethel, Nome, Kotz.
BARGE 400	1	12,500	.....	42,500	5,500	.....	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nome, Kotz, Wainwright, Barrow.
BARGE 500–1	17	13,392	460	.....	.....	.....	105	50	Seatt.-Whittier.
BARGE 500–3	17	13,392	460	.....	.....	.....	105	50	Seatt.-Whittier.
BARGE 414	13	12,500	250	.....	.....	.....	.....	50	Seatt.-Whittier.
BARGE ATKA	12	12,500	250	.....	.....	.....	.....	35	Seatt.-Whittier.
BARGE 407	8	12,500	250	.....	.....	.....	.....	50	Seatt.-Whittier.
BARGE 411	3	12,500	250	.....	.....	.....	.....	35	Seatt.-Whittier.
BARGE KODIAK	2	9,100	175	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	Seatt.-Whittier.
Unscheduled Tug and Barge Service									
BARGE 450–10	.....	16,200	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	Alask-Hawaii.
BARGE 250–11	.....	5,970	.....	16,150	3,000	.....	.....	.....	Concord, CA-Valdez, Alaska.
BARGE ISLA BONITA	.....	12,500	.....	42,500	5,500	.....	.....	.....	Concord,CA-Valdez, Alaska.
BARGE ALASKA	.....	13,185	.....	.....	12,500	.....	.....	.....	Nikiski-Sacramento, Rivergate.
BARGE OREGON	.....	13,185	.....	.....	12,500	.....	.....	.....	Nikiski-Sacramento, Rivergate.
BARGE HAWAII	.....	15,999	.....	.....	12,000	.....	.....	.....	Nikiski-Sacramento, Rivergate.
BARGE CORDOVA	.....	9,100	.....	32,300	4,500	.....	.....	.....	Portland-Dutch Harbor.
BARGE 407	.....	12,500	.....	42,500	5,500	.....	.....	.....	San Juan-Gulf.
BARGE 450–10	.....	16,200	.....	.....	.....	149,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Anchorage, Alaska.
BARGE 450–3	.....	16,200	.....	.....	.....	149,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Anchorage, Alaska.
BARGE 450–11	.....	16,200	.....	.....	.....	149,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Anchorage, Alaska.
BARGE 450–7	.....	16,200	.....	.....	.....	149,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Anchorage, Alaska.
BARGE 102	.....	16,200	.....	.....	.....	149,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Anchorage, Alaska.
BARGE 450–6	.....	16,200	.....	.....	.....	149,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Anchorage, Nikiski, AK.
BARGE 450–10	.....	16,200	.....	.....	.....	149,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Capt. Bay, Alaska.
BARGE MCKINLEY	.....	9,100	.....	32,300	4,500	.....	.....	.....	Seatt.-Dutch Harbor.
BARGE 250–3	.....	5,970	.....	16,150	3,000	.....	.....	.....	Seatt.-Dutch Harbor.
BARGE KETCHIKAN	.....	9,100	.....	32,300	4,500	.....	.....	.....	Seatt.-Dutch Harbor.
BARGE 450–11	.....	16,200	.....	.....	.....	149,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Dutch Harbor, Alaska.
BARGE 250–10	.....	5,330	.....	.....	.....	49,999	.....	.....	Seatt.-Juneau, Alaska.
BARGE 450–7	.....	16,200	.....	.....	.....	149,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Ketchikan, Alaska.
BARGE 450–10	.....	16,200	.....	.....	.....	149,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nikiski, Alaska.
BARGE 450–11	.....	16,200	.....	.....	.....	149,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nikiski, Alaska.
BARGE 450–3	.....	16,200	.....	.....	.....	149,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nikiski, Alaska.
BARGE 450–7	.....	16,200	.....	.....	.....	149,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nikiski, Alaska.
BARGE 450–6	.....	16,200	.....	.....	.....	149,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nikiski, Alaska.
BARGE 101	.....	11,400	.....	.....	.....	103,968	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nikiski, Alaska.

TABLE II.—CROWLEY MARINE SERVICES, INC. (AN AFFILIATED COMPANY OF APPLICANT)—Continued

Barge Vessel*	Voyages	Capacity							Itinerary
		DWT	TEU	CUBE	S. Ton	BBL	Trailer	Ratio	
BARGE 151	.....	1,500	.....	3,060	750	10,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nome, Kotz, Capt. Bay, W. AK.
BARGE 152	.....	1,500	.....	3,060	750	10,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nome, Kotz, Capt. Bay, W. AK.
BARGE 154	.....	1,500	.....	3,060	750	10,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nome, Kotz, Capt. Bay, W. AK.
BARGE 160–1	.....	1,500	.....	3,060	750	10,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nome, Kotz, Capt. Bay, W. AK.
BARGE 160–4	.....	1,500	.....	3,060	750	10,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nome, Kotz, Capt. Bay, W. AK.
BARGE 450–10	.....	16,200	.....	.....	.....	149,000	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nome,Kotz, Capt. Bay, W. AK.
BARGE 101	.....	11,400	.....	.....	.....	103,968	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nome, Kotz, Capt. Bay, W. AK.
BARGE 250–10	.....	5,330	.....	.....	.....	49,983	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nome, Kotz, Capt. Bay, W. AK.
BARGE 570	.....	7,910	.....	.....	3,000	52,938	.....	.....	Seatt.-Nome, Kotz, Capt. Bay, W. AK.
BARGE MALOLO	.....	9,100	.....	32,300	4,500	.....	.....	.....	Vancouver, WA-Anchorage, Alaska.

*All the named barges are accompanied by a tugboat for propulsion.

Any person, firm or corporation having any interest in the application for section 656 consent and desiring to submit comments concerning Crowley's request must by 5:00 PM (30 days after the date of publication) file comments in triplicate to the Secretary, Maritime Administration, Room 7210, Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20590.

By Order of the Maritime Administrator.

Dated: November 4, 1996.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–28775 Filed 11–6–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Docket No. AB–290 (Sub-No. 180X)]

Norfolk and Western Railway Company—Abandonment Exemption—in McDowell County, WV

Norfolk and Western Railway Company (NW) has filed a notice of exemption under 49 CFR Part 1152 Subpart F—*Exempt Abandonments* to abandon a 2.5-mile line of its railroad from milepost T–16.0 at Pageton and milepost T–18.5 at Anawalt, in McDowell County, WV.[1]

NW has certified that: (1) No local traffic has moved over the line for at least 2 years; (2) any overhead traffic on the line can be rerouted; (3) no formal complaint filed by a user of rail service on the line (or by a state or local government entity acting on behalf of such user) regarding cessation of service over the line either is pending with the Surface Transportation Board (Board) or with any U.S. District Court or has been decided in favor of complainant within the 2-year period; and (4) the requirements at 49 CFR 1105.7 (environmental reports), 49 CFR 1105.8 (historic reports), 49 CFR 1105.11 (transmittal letter), 49 CFR 1105.12 (newspaper publication), and 49 CFR 1152.50(d)(1) (notice to governmental agencies) have been met.

As a condition to this exemption, any employee adversely affected by the abandonment shall be protected under *Oregon Short Line R. Co.—Abandonment—Goshen,* 360 I.C.C. 91 (1979). To address whether this condition adequately protects affected employees, a petition for partial revocation under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) must be filed.

Provided no formal expression of intent to file an offer of financial assistance (OFA) has been received, this exemption will be effective on December 7, 1996, unless stayed pending reconsideration. Petitions to stay that do not involve environmental issues,[2] formal expressions of intent to file an OFA under 49 CFR 1152.27(c)(2),[3] and trail use/rail banking requests under 49 CFR 1152.29[4] must be filed by November 18, 1996. Petitions to reopen or requests for public use conditions under 49 CFR 1152.28 must be filed by November 27, 1996, with: Office of the Secretary, Case Control Branch, Surface Transportation Board, 1201 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20423.

A copy of any petition filed with the Board should be sent to applicant's representative: James R. Paschall, General Attorney, Norfolk Southern Corporation, Three Commercial Place, Norfolk, VA 23510–2191.

If the verified notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio.*

NW has filed an environmental report which addresses the abandonment's effects, if any, on the environment and historic resources. The Section of Environmental Analysis (SEA) will issue an environmental assessment (EA) by November 12, 1996. Interested

[1] Pursuant to 49 CFR 1152.50(d)(2), the railroad must file a verified notice with the Board at least 50 days before the abandonment or discontinuance is to be consummated. The applicant in its verified notice, indicated a proposed consummation date of December 6, 1996. However, because the verified notice was filed on October 18, 1996, consummation should have not been proposed to take place prior to December 7, 1996. Applicant's representative has been contacted and has confirmed that the correct consummation date is on or after December 7, 1996.

[2] The Board will grant a stay if an informed decision on environmental issues (whether raised by a party or by the Board's Section of Environmental Analysis in its independent investigation) cannot be made before the exemption's effective date. *See Exemption of Out-of-Service Rail Lines,* 5 I.C.C.2d 377 (1989). Any request for a stay should be filed as soon as possible so that the Board may take appropriate action before the exemption's effective date.

[3] See Exempt. of Rail Abandonment—Offers of Finan. Assist., 4 I.C.C.2d 164 (1987).

[4] The Board will accept late-filed trail use requests as long as the abandonment has not been consummated and the abandoning railroad is willing to negotiate an agreement.