

The TCC 50 meeting will be held at IMO Headquarters on 21 June 2001 and will focus on the following items:

- Technical Co-operation Programme (ITCP) for 2002–2003;
- Regional Co-ordination and Delivery including a review of IMO's pilot project on regional presence;
- IMO Women in Development Programme;
- Institutional Development and Fellowships;
- Report on the status of funding for the translation of model courses; and
- Election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of TCC for 2002.

The 86th Session of the Council is scheduled for 18–22 June 2001, at the IMO Headquarters in London. Items of interest include:

- Committees reports;
- Report on the International Conference on Liability and Compensation for Bunker Oil Pollution Damage;
- Work Program and Budget for 2002–2003;
- Review of the Organization's financial framework in accordance with Assembly resolution A.877(21);
- Report on the status of conventions and other multilateral instruments in respect of which the Organization performs its function;
- World Maritime University;
- IMO International Maritime Law Institute;
- Relations with intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations; and
- Assembly matters.

Members of the public may attend these meetings up to the seating capacity of the room. Interested persons may seek information by writing: Director, International Affairs, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, Commandant (G–CI), Room 2114, 2100 Second Street, SW., Washington, DC 20593–0001 or by calling: (202) 267–2280.

Dated: May 11, 2001.

**Stephen M. Miller,**

*Executive Secretary, Shipping Coordinating Committee, Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 01–12850 Filed 5–21–01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4710–01–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Notice Number 3667]

### Shipping Coordinating Committee; International Maritime Organization Legal Committee; Notice of Meetings

The Shipping Coordinating Committee (SHC) will conduct open meetings between June and October, 2001, to assist in formulating the United States position on International Maritime Organization (IMO) Legal

Committee negotiations of a draft protocol to the Athens Convention Relating to the Carriage of Passengers and Their Luggage by Sea, 1974 (draft Athens protocol), and also to prepare for other items on the agenda of the eighty-third session of the Legal Committee (LEG 83). LEG 83 will meet from 8 to 12 October 2001.

The U.S. delegation to LEG 83 will consider views on issues raised by the draft Athens protocol as indicated below, but will also allow time for discussion of other topics raised at the meetings. To submit views on the draft Athens protocol in advance of the scheduled meetings, please send them either electronically to [dgoettle@comdt.uscg.mil](mailto:dgoettle@comdt.uscg.mil) or by fax to the attention of LT Daniel J. Goettle at (202) 267–4496 or by mail to Commandant (G–LMI), U.S. Coast Guard, 2100 Second St. SW., Washington, D.C., 20593–0001, attention LT Daniel J. Goettle. Any written submissions may be posted at <http://afls14.jag.af.mil/dscgi/ds.py/View/Collection-2640>. Additionally, changes to the below schedule of SHC meetings will be posted on this site as well as published in the **Federal Register**. The current text of the draft Athens protocol can be found at: <http://www.uio.no/~erikro/WWW/corgr/index.html>.

The following meeting schedule has been established to allow time for the preparation of U.S. submissions, if deemed necessary, for consideration of LEG 83. The IMO requires submissions of six or more pages to be sent no later than August 6, 2001, and submissions of less than six pages to be sent no later than September 10, 2001. Each meeting will be held at U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, DC 20593–0001. The meetings will be held in room 2415 at 10:00 a.m. The SHC meeting dates and issues for discussion are as follows:

*June 14, 2001:* The U.S. delegation will consider views on the draft Athens protocol liability scheme. This topic will include consideration of views on: liability of the carrier (Article 3); the performing carrier (Article 4); contributory fault (Article 6); limit of liability for personal injury (Article 7); and the loss of right to limit liability (Article 13). All article references are to the Athens Convention as modified by the draft Athens protocol.

*July 10, 2001:* The U.S. delegation will consider views on: the draft Athens protocol compulsory insurance provisions (Article 4bis); the time-bar (Article 16); the jurisdictional provisions (Article 17); recognition and enforcement (Article 17bis); invalidity of contractual provisions (Article 18);

and other conventions on limitation of liability (Article 19).

*August 7, 2001:* The U.S. delegation will consider views on all other articles and any other issue raised through a written submission to the Coast Guard after July 10 or raised at this meeting.

*September 11, 2001:* This meeting is reserved and will be held if necessary to discuss any further views on the draft Athens protocol.

*October 2, 2001:* In addition to the draft Athens protocol, this meeting will consider views on the remainder of the LEG 83 agenda items. The other issues on the agenda are expected to include: development of a draft convention on wreck removal; the implementation of the International Convention on Liability and Compensation for Damage in Connection With the Carriage of Hazardous and Noxious Substances by Sea; and consideration of two draft resolutions submitted to the Legal Committee by the Joint International Maritime Organization/International Labor Organization Ad Hoc Expert Working Group on Liability and Compensation Regarding Claims for Death, Personal Injury and Abandonment of Seafarers, which met from 30 April through 4 May 2001. The first resolution provides guidelines for member states to ensure that shipowners have the financial means to cover liability for the abandonment of seafarers, and the second resolution provides such guidelines for the death or injury of seafarers.

Members of the public are invited to attend the SHC meetings up to the seating capacity of the room. For further information, please contact Captain Joseph F. Ahern or Lieutenant Daniel J. Goettle, U.S. Coast Guard, Office of Maritime and International Law (G–LMI), 2100 Second Street, SW., Washington, DC 20593–0001; telephone (202) 267–1527; fax (202) 267–4496.

Dated: May 16, 2001.

**Stephen M. Miller,**

*Executive Secretary, Shipping Coordinating Committee, Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 01–12852 Filed 5–21–01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4710–07–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Coast Guard

[USCG–2001–9267]

### Approval for Experimental Shipboard Installations of Ballast Water Treatment Systems

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is requesting comments about how to provide incentives to further develop ballast water treatment (BWT) technologies and reduce the potential for introducing nonindigenous species (NIS) to the waters of the United States via discharged ballast water. Ideally, vessel owners and operators given approval to install prototype BWT systems would be considered to be in compliance with the first set of future BWT requirements, when they are implemented. Depending on the information received, we may begin developing the type of incentives outlined in this notice.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must reach the Docket Management Facility on or before July 23, 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** To make sure your comments and related material are not entered in the docket more than once, please submit them by only one of the following means:

(1) By mail to the Docket Management Facility, (USCG-2001-9267) U.S.

Department of Transportation, room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001.

(2) By delivery to room PL-401 on the Plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is 202-366-9329.

(3) By fax to the Docket Management Facility at 202-493-2251.

(4) By electronic means through the Web Site for the Docket Management System at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

The Docket Management Facility maintains the public docket for this notice. Comments and material received from the public will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at room PL-401 on the Plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. You may also find this docket on the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For questions on this notice, call Dr. Richard Everett, Project Manager, Office of Operating and Environmental Standards (G-MSO), Coast Guard, telephone 202-267-0214. For questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Dorothy Beard, Chief, Dockets, Department of Transportation, telephone 202-366-5149.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Request for Comments**

We invite you to provide your views on: The program described in this

notice; new and other approaches not identified in this notice; the potential impacts of such a program (including possible unintended or unanticipated consequences); and, any supporting or relevant data or information that you would like the Coast Guard to consider during the development of an approval program. Please explain your views as clearly as possible, describe any assumptions used, and provide copies of data or technical information used to support your views. If you submit comments and related material, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this notice (USCG-2001-9267), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. You may submit your comments and material by mail, hand delivery, fax, or electronic means to the Docket Management Facility as indicated under **ADDRESSES**. Please submit your comments and material by only one means. If you submit them by mail or hand delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you submit them by mail and would like to know they reached the Facility, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. The Coast Guard will consider all comments received during the comment period.

**Why Is the Coast Guard Asking for Comments?**

The problem of how to reduce the threat of introducing foreign organisms to the waters of the U.S. via ballast water discharged from vessels is complex. A number of factors contribute to the complexity of this issue, including: The relative volumes and pumping rates involved in ballasting operations; the great variability in voyage durations and routes; and the great variability in the physical, chemical, and biological make up of the ballast water carried by the vessels that operate in U.S. waters.

Under paragraphs (a) and (b) in section 1101 of the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act (Pub. L. 101-646), as amended by the National Invasive Species Act of 1996 (NISA) (Pub. L. 104-332), Congress directed the Coast Guard to issue regulations and guidelines on ballast water management practices to prevent the introduction of NIS to U.S. waters via the discharge of foreign water from ballast tanks of ships. Specifically, these regulations are to identify mid-ocean ballast water exchange (BWE), or environmentally sound alternative ballast water

treatment (BWT) methods determined by the Coast Guard to be as effective as BWE in preventing and controlling infestations of aquatic nuisance species, as acceptable BWT technologies. These regulations are contained in 33 CFR part 151, subparts C and D; we issued these regulations on May 17, 1999 (64 FR 26672).

The development of effective BWT technologies, capable of significantly reducing the probability of introducing foreign organisms via ballast water discharges, is essential. The NISA explicitly directs that such technologies must be "as effective as (BWE)." Currently, the actual "effectiveness" of BWE in reducing the threat of introductions is not well resolved. Concerns have been voiced that exchange as a practice will be inherently difficult to quantify. Furthermore, because safe exchange using existing ballast water systems is not practicable on all voyages, exchange is not capable of providing a sufficient level of protection against the introduction of unwanted foreign organisms. An increasing number of alternative BWT technologies are being developed and tested at small, bench-top, or dockside scales. However, complete evaluation and refinement of the capabilities of such systems requires ship-scale installations that are tested for longer periods of time under a wide range of conditions.

As on-board installation and testing costs are likely to be significant, vessel owners are understandably reluctant to participate in on-board testing projects without assurances that installed experimental systems will be accepted for some specified time should regulations come into effect during the testing period.

The Coast Guard is considering developing a program that would allow vessel owners to apply for advance, conditional approval of experimental BWT systems installed and tested on board their operating vessels. Even though only a limited number of the experimental systems would be approved, the program would help nurture the establishment of collaborative partnerships between technology developers and vessel owners while standards and requirements are being developed. If we approve an experimental BWT system under the terms of the program, it would be considered to meet the requirements of the first set of future regulations regarding BWT.

### Are There Any Particular Questions the Coast Guard Is Interested in Having Answered?

While we welcome comments on every aspect on this approval program, to help us ensure that studies are conducted according to well-established principles of experimental design and analysis, we encourage opinions on what specific protocols should be included in the studies associated with the program.

### What Are the Details Being Considered for This Program for Approval of Experimental Shipboard Installations of BWT Systems?

The basic procedures and conditions envisioned for the approval program are as follows:

#### Approval Process

Applications for approval of experimental BWT systems would be accepted and reviewed as follows:

- Applications for advance approval of experimental ballast water treatment systems would be accepted at any time.
- Within 10 working days of receiving an application, applicants would be sent (via surface mail, e-mail, or facsimile transmission) a notice of the completeness of the application package. Applicants with incomplete submissions would be sent an explanation of deficiencies. Incomplete application packages would be returned (provided a self-addressed label and sufficient postage are included), or if deficiencies are minimal, held for 30 days in order to allow the applicant to correct the deficiencies.
- Formal, full reviews of supporting data and proposed study plans would be completed within 45 days of receipt of the application.
- Formal reviews would be conducted by panels of biologists and engineers with expertise in experimental investigations of biota associated with ballast water, water treatment technology, naval architecture, and marine engineering.
- The review panels would provide recommendations to the Coast Guard on the acceptability of the supporting evidence and study plans submitted with each application.
- The Coast Guard would accept or reject each application on the basis of reviews by Coast Guard staff and the recommendations of the review panel.

#### Criteria for Review

Applications for approval of experimental ballast water treatment systems would be evaluated on the completeness of the following information:

- A letter of commitment from the owner of the specified vessel, the manufacturer or developer of the treatment system, and the principle investigators conducting the tests, stating their intents to carry out all components of the study plan for which they are responsible.
- Documentation stating that the residual concentrations of any primary treatment chemicals or chemicals that occur as disinfection by-products meet all applicable local, state, federal, and tribal requirements.
- Documentation from preliminary, smaller scale, experiments that demonstrates the potential of the system to significantly reduce the threat of introducing nonindigenous species via ballast water discharges. The results would demonstrate a taxonomic breadth of effectiveness across a suite of organisms such as bacteria, phytoplankton (including dinoflagellates and diatoms), heterotrophic protists, rotifers, copepods (cyclopoid and harpacticoid; larval, post-larval, and adult life stages), mollusc larvae, polychaete larvae, mysids, decapod crustaceans (crabs and shrimp; larval, post-larval; and adult), and fish.
- Preliminary and proposed testing experiments would control for confounding factors and include statistical analyses that include formal power analyses (a determination of the ability of a particular statistical test to actually detect a difference among the data) for each statistical test.
- A statement with explanations of the scalability of preliminary experiments.
- A detailed study plan that:
  1. Is organized according to a standardized format (to be developed).
  2. Experimentally compares the effectiveness of the treatment system to the effectiveness of a specified mode of ballast water exchange.
  3. Evaluates the effectiveness of the treatment system over a range of operational (including the cumulative hours of operation, volumes treated, and time since the experimental tanks were last cleaned of sediment) and environmental (including abundance of organisms, organic and inorganic "load", temperature and salinity of water, sea surface characteristics) conditions during operations.
  4. Identifies explicit hypotheses about limiting conditions of the specified ship and route.
  5. Assures that samples would be representative of the flow or volume from which they are taken.
  6. Contains a detailed quality assurance and/or quality control plan.

### Conditions of Approval

- Experimental systems would be approved for use on specified ships operating on specified routes.
- Approval of an experimental system would lapse after 1 year if the system was not installed or the testing begun as proposed.
- Experimental systems would be approved for use in all U.S. waters, including the Great Lakes and the Hudson River upstream of the George Washington Bridge.
- Systems approved under the experimental approval program would be considered to meet all BWT requirements promulgated by the Coast Guard for a period of 5 years, or until the first BWT standard is revised, whichever date is earlier. However, in the event that subsequent work reveals adverse effects on ecology or human health, the tests will be discontinued and the approval will lapse.
- Systems approved under the experimental approval program would be subject to all subsequent standards and regulations upon the expiration of the experimental approval period.
- Experimental approval would be contingent on adherence to a detailed study plan designed to test the effectiveness of the treatment system over a specified period of time. The study plan would be described completely in the application and agreed upon by the applicant and the U.S. Coast Guard.
- The experimental team would be required to submit quarterly status reports identifying tasks completed and unanticipated problems. An annual report documenting the work and results to date would be required after every 12 months of testing. A final report documenting the study findings and conclusions would be required no later than six months after the on-board testing is completed.
- Vessels receiving approval for experimental BWT systems would be subject to inspections by Coast Guard personnel to verify the presence and condition of experimental systems.
- The principle scientists and engineers responsible for conducting and analyzing the tests would attend and participate in a technical workshop during which the results of the study, along with other similar studies, would be presented and discussed. The workshops would be organized by the Coast Guard but travel costs and salary would be the responsibility of the participants.

**Sample Timeline for Advance Approval Process**

Following is an example of a timeline for the approval of an experimental

ballast water treatment system. For illustrative purposes, the timeline incorporates the development of a

standard and regulations during the test period.

Date	Action
Submit (S) .....	Application package submitted and reviewed for completeness.
S + 10 days .....	Application package accepted or rejected for submission to review panel. If complete, application package submitted to independent review panel.
S + 45 days .....	Application approved or denied. Final approval pends agreement on study plan.
S + 90 days (A) .....	Study plan negotiated and agreed-upon by Coast Guard and applicant. This date is considered the Approval Date (A). Treatment system considered meeting regulatory requirements for 5 years from this date.
Install (I) .....	Experimental system installed and adjusted; preliminary organization for study completed. Experimental work begins.
I + 3 months .....	First progress report submitted to USCG.
I + 6 months .....	Second progress report submitted to USCG.
I + 9 months .....	Third Progress report submitted to USCG.
I + 12 months .....	Annual Report submitted to USCG. Study continues according to schedule, with quarterly and annual reports submitted to the USCG.
Standard/Reg .....	First U.S. standard and regulations established for ballast water treatment. Operation of experimental system continues under study plan.
A + 5 years .....	Vessel must meet existing standard and regulations, regardless of date standard and regulations are promulgated.

**What Is the Coast Guard's Authority for Taking This Action?**

Under 16 U.S.C. 4711, the Coast Guard (acting on behalf of the Secretary of Transportation) is authorized to take this action.

Dated: March 30, 2001.

**R.C. North,**

*Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Assistant Commandant for Marine, Safety and Environmental Protection.*

[FR Doc. 01-12719 Filed 5-21-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-15-U**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Federal Aviation Administration**

**Approval of Noise Compatibility Program Camarillo Airport, Camarillo, CA**

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) announces its findings on the Noise Compatibility Program submitted by the county of Ventura, Camarillo, California, under the provisions of Title I of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979 (Public Law 96-193) and Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 150 (FAR Part 150). These findings are made in recognition of the description of Federal and nonfederal responsibilities in Senate Report No. 96-52 (1980). On September 10, 1998, the FAA determined that the noise exposure maps submitted by the county of Ventura under FAR Part 150 were in compliance with applicable requirements. On May 4, 2001, the

Acting Associate Administrator for Airports approved the Camarillo Airport Noise Compatibility Program. All twenty-three of the program measures have been approved. Fourteen measures were approved as voluntary measures and nine measures were approved outright.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** The effective date of the FAA's approval of the Camarillo Airport Noise Compatibility Program is May 4, 2001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brian Armstrong, Airport Planner, Airports Division, AWP-611.1, Federal Aviation Administration, Western-Pacific Region. Mailing address: P.O. Box 92007, Los Angeles, California 90009-2007. Telephone: (310) 725-3614. Street address: 15000 Aviation Boulevard, Hawthorne, California 90261. Documents reflecting this FAA action may be reviewed at this location.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This notice announces that the FAA has given its overall approval to the Noise Compatibility Program for the Camarillo Airport, effective May 4, 2001. Under section 104(a) of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"), an airport operator who has previously submitted a Noise Exposure Map, may submit to the FAA, a Noise Compatibility Program which sets forth the measures taken or proposed by the airport operator for the reduction of existing noncompatible land uses and prevention of additional noncompatible land uses within the area covered by the Noise Exposure Maps. The Act requires such programs to be developed in consultation with interested and affected parties including local

communities, government agencies, airport users, and FAA personnel.

Each airport Noise Compatibility Program developed in accordance with FAR Part 150 is a local program, not a federal program. The FAA does not substitute its judgment for that of the airport proprietor with respect to which measures should be recommended for action. The FAA's approval or disapproval of FAR Part 150 program recommendations is measured according to the standards expressed in FAR Part 150 and is limited to the following determinations:

a. The Noise Compatibility Program was developed in accordance with the provisions and procedures of FAR Part 150;

b. Program measures are reasonably consistent with achieving the goals of reducing existing noncompatible land uses around the airport and preventing the introduction of additional noncompatible land uses;

c. Program measures would not create an undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce, unjustly discriminate against types or classes of aeronautical uses, violate the terms of airport grant agreements, or intrude into areas preempted by the Federal Government; and

d. Program measures relating to the use of flight procedures can be implemented within the period covered by the program without derogating safety, adversely affecting the efficient use and management of the navigable airspace and air traffic control systems, or adversely affecting other powers and responsibilities of the Administrator prescribed by law.

Specific limitations with respect to FAA's approval of an airport Noise Compatibility Program are delineated in