to satisfy the marine safety requirements.

(m) Identify training that is consistent with qualification requirements and the method for its provision.

(n) Indicate the requirements and procedures for conducting periodic testing for certification of capability.

3. Legal Requirements

(a) Identify applicable laws and regulations.

(b) Include any international law, treaty, convention issues that would preclude or unnecessarily limit an international tug of opportunity system.

(c) Identify salvage and operational legal constraints.

(d) Identify cabotage legal constraints associated with foreign towing vessels operating in U.S. waters.

(e) Indicate any liability coverage issues potentially affecting responders in the international tug of opportunity system.

(f) Indicate the use of any contractual relationship between the international tug of opportunity system and service recipients to further limit liability.

4. Fiscal Administration

(a) Identify the fee structure for organizational administration and incident-specific assistance services, the penalties for noncompliance, the billing process, and the method of collection.

(b) Identify the difference between member and nonmember use of services.

(c) Identify the process for reviewing service charges upon challenge.

(d) Identify the procedure for reimbursement of contractor and governmental authorities.

(e) Identify the requirements and expected methods to be used for initial capital investments.

Marine Safety Requirements

1. Tug Performance Criteria

(a) A tug of opportunity must be able to transit and maneuver in the Strait of Juan de Fuca in wave heights of 3 meters or more with sustained wind speed of greater than 20 knots (kts), and in offshore wave heights of 4 meters or more with sustained wind speeds of greater than 30 kts to get a line onto a disabled vessel.

(b) A tug of opportunity must meet the following requirements shown in the table in accordance with the wave heights listed.

Bollard Pull	Wave height
Class A >60 tons	5–6 meters.
Class B 40–59 tons	4 meters.
Class C 35–39 tons	3 meters.
Class D <35 tons	calm.

(c) The minimum speed capability for a tug of opportunity is 13 kts under calm conditions.

(d) The minimum speed capability for a tug of opportunity is 10 kts under degraded conditions with offshore wave heights of 4 meters.

(e) A tug of opportunity must provide a stable work platform in wave heights of 4 meters offshore or 3 meters in the Strait of Juan de Fuca.

2. Tug Equipment Criteria

(a) Towline and terminal gear required for towing astern must be as per 33 CFR 164.74 or equivalent standard.

(b) A tug of opportunity must provide tests and inspections for the gear required in item 2 of the documentation requirements as found in 33 CFR 164.80.

(c) A tug of opportunity must have on board a line handling winch with—brake capacity equal to 3 times the bollard pull, line pull equal to ⅓ times the bollard pull, and an abort mechanism.

(d) All required tow lines must have a minimum breaking strength equal to 5 times the bollard pull.

3. Crew Skills

(a) Manning standards for tugs and the documents and licenses required for tug crews must meet U.S. Coast Guard regulations as per 46 CFR 15.

(b) The master of a tug of opportunity shall ensure crew proficiency in emergency operations and towing operations, and identify skills which must be developed and maintained through training and exercises.

(c) The master of a tug of opportunity shall certify to the tug of opportunity system operator that the vessel has the capability to tow deep draft vessels under adverse conditions, and may be required to demonstrate that capability.

(e) The master of a tug of opportunity shall ensure that the number of trained and skilled crew members on board is sufficient to meet tug of opportunity system requirements.

4. Training

(a) Each tug of opportunity must have a training/certification program that ensures that crew members acquire and maintain the skills required to operate towing equipment. Each tug of opportunity must also document these skills.

(b) Each tug of opportunity must have an exercise program for quarterly towing drills.

5. Substance Abuse Standards

Uninspected vessels included in a tug of opportunity program must meet the drug and alcohol testing standards as described in 46 CFR 16.230.

6. Response Times

(a) The maximum response time is 2 hours for the area east of the line connecting New Dungeness Light with Discovery Light and all points north and south of these lights. This area includes those waters required for escort vessels in 33 CFR 168.40(b).

(b) The maximum response time is 2.5 hours for the area of the Strait of Juan de Fuca west of the line connecting New Dungeness Light with Discovery Light to a north and south line through the buoy position at the western end of the Strait of Juan de Fuca.

(c) The maximum response time is 6 hours from a north and south line through the buoy position at the western end of the Strait of Juan de Fuca extending in a 50-mile radius offshore.

(d) The maximum response time is 12 hours for the remainder of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary southward. The southern boundary of the area is to be avoided.

Procedural

The original notice of meeting for CGD 96–044 was published on September 12, 1996 (61 FR 48202). Attendance is open to the public. Persons wishing to make oral presentations at the meeting should notify the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** no later than October 10, 1996.

Information on Services for Individuals With Disabilities

For information on facilities or services for individuals with disabilities or to request special assistance at the meeting, contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

Dated: October 2, 1996.

G.N. Naccara,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard Acting Chief, Marine Safety and Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 96–25661 Filed 10–4–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

Federal Aviation Administration

Approval of Noise Compatibility Program; Kahului Airport, Kahului, Maui, Hawaii

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) announces its findings on the Noise Compatibility Program submitted by the State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation under the provisions of Title I of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979 (Public Law 96–193) and 14 CFR Part 150. These findings are made in recognition of the description of Federal and nonfederal responsibilities in Senate Report No. 96–52 (1980). On March 4, 1996 the FAA determined that the noise exposure maps submitted by the State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation under Part 150 were in compliance with applicable requirements. On August 30, 1996, the Associate Administrator for Airports approved the Kahului Airport Noise Compatibility Program. All eight (8) of the program elements were approved. One (1) element was approved for study only and one (1) element was approved as a voluntary measure.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The effective date of the FAA's approval of the Kahului Airport noise compatibility program is August 30, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David J. Welhouse, Airport Planner, Honolulu Airports District Office, Federal Aviation Administration, Box 50244, Honolulu, Hawaii 96850–0001, Telephone: (808) 541–1243; street address: 30 Ala Moana Blvd., Room 7116. 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 Kahului Airport, effective August 30, 1996.

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 Federal Aviation Regulations (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 Part 150 of the Act 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 FAR Part 150, Section 150.5. Approval 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 Honolulu, Hawaii.

The State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation submitted to the FAA on October 26, 1995, the Noise Exposure Maps, descriptions, and other documentation produced during the noise compatibility planning study conducted from January 1994 through September 1995. The Kahului Airport noise exposure maps were determined by FAA to be in compliance with applicable requirements on March 4, 1996. Notice of this determination was published in the Federal Register on March 18, 1996.

The Kahului Airport study 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 1998. 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 March 4, 1996 and was required by a provision of the Act to 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 eight (8) 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 part 150 have been satisfied. The overall program, therefore, was approved by the Associate Administrator for Airports effective August 30, 1996.

All eight (8) of the program elements were approved. One (1) element was approved for study only and one (1) element was approved as a voluntary measure. Approved program measure include: Purchase private properties within the 75 DNL contour; Provide sound attenuation for residences within the 60 to 75 DNL contours; Monitor development proposals in the Kahului Airport environs; Install and operate a noise monitoring system; and annually monitor aircraft noise levels and operations at Kahului Airport. Approved for study was the measure to formalize the informal runway use program. The clarification of an informal runway use program was approved as a voluntary measure.

These determinations are set forth in detail in a Record of Approval endorsed by the Associate Administrator for Airports on August 30, 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 State of Hawaii.

Issued in Hawthorne, California on September 23, 1996.

Herman C. Bliss,

Manager, Airports Division, AWP–600, Western-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 96–25603 Filed 10–4–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Receipt of Noise Compatibility Program and Request for Review; Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport; Springfield, OH

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) announces that it is reviewing a proposed noise compatibility program that was submitted for Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport under the provisions of Title I of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979 (Public Law 96–193) (hereinafter referred to as ''the Act'') and 14 CFR Part 150 by the City of Springfield, Ohio. This program was submitted subsequent to a determination by the FAA that associated noise exposure maps submitted under 14 CFR Part 150 for Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport were in compliance with applicable requirements effective August 11, 1995. The proposed noise compatibility program will be approved or disapproved on or before March 18, 1997.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The effective date of the start of the FAA's review of the noise compatibility program is September 19, 1996. The public comment period ends November 18, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lawrence C. King, Airports Engineer, Federal Aviation Administration, Detroit Airports District Office, Willow Run Airport, East, 8820 Beck Road, Belleville, Michigan 48111. Comments on the proposed noise compatibility program should also be submitted to the above office.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice announces that the FAA is reviewing a proposed noise compatibility program for Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport which will be approved or disapproved on or before March 18, 1997. This notice also announces the availability of this program for public review and comment.

An airport operator who has submitted noise exposure maps that are found by the FAA to be in compliance with the requirements of Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 150, promulgated pursuant to Title I of the Act, may submit a noise compatibility program for FAA approval which sets forth the measures the operator has taken or proposes for the reduction of existing noncompatible uses and for the prevention of the introduction of additional noncompatible uses.

The FAA has formally received the noise compatibility program for Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport, effective on September 19, 1996. It was requested that the FAA review this material and that the noise mitigation measures, to be implemented jointly by the airport and surrounding communities, be approved as a noise compatibility program under section 104(b) of the Act. Preliminary review of the submitted material indicates that it conforms to the requirements for the submittal of noise compatibility programs, but that further review will be necessary prior to approval or disapproval of the program. The formal review period, limited by law to a maximum of 180 days, will be completed on or before March 18, 1997.

The FAA's detailed evaluation will be conducted under the provisions of 14 CFR Part 150, section 150.33. The primary considerations in the evaluation process are whether the proposed measures may reduce the level of aviation safety, create an undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce, or be reasonably consistent with obtaining the goal of reducing existing noncompatible land uses and preventing the introduction of additional noncompatible land uses.

Interested persons are invited to comment on the proposed program with specific reference to these factors. All comments, other than those properly addressed to local land use authorities, will be considered by the FAA to the extent practicable. Copies of the noise exposure maps, the FAA's evaluation of the maps, and the proposed noise compatibility program are available for examination at the following locations:

Federal Aviation Administration, Detroit Airports District Office, Willow Run Airport, East, 8820 Beck Road, Belleville, Michigan 48111

Mr. Matthew J. Kridler, Manager, City of Springfield, Springfield City Hall, 76 East High Street, Springfield, OH 45502

Questions may be directed to the individual named above under the heading, **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Issued in Belleville, Michigan, on September 19, 1996.

Robert H. Allen,

Acting Manager, Detroit Airports District Office, FAA Great Lakes Region.

[FR Doc. 96–25605 Filed 10–4–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Federal Railroad Administration

Notice of Application for Approval of Discontinuance or Modification of a Railroad Signal System or Relief From the Requirements of Title 49 CFR Part 236

Pursuant to Title 459 CFR Part 235 and 49 U.S.C. App. 26, the following railroads have petitioned the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) seeking approval for the discontinuance or modification of the signal system or relief from the requirements of Title 49 CFR Part 236 as detailed below.

Block Signal Application (BS–AP)–No. 3406

Applicant: Southern Pacific Lines, Mr., J.A. Turner, Engineer—Signals, Southern Pacific Building, One Market Plaza, San Francisco, California 94105.

The Southern Pacific Lines, St. Louis and Southwestern Railroad seek approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of the automatic block signal (ABS) system, associated with the spring switch at milepost 431.5, rear Alden Bridge, Louisiana, Central Region, Midwest Division, Pine Bluff Subdivision, Shreveport Line; consisting of the discontinuance and removal of the two eastbound trailing point signals at milepost 431.5, discontinuance and removal of the two eastbound ''D'' signal at milepost 432.8, conversion of the westbound facing point signal to a switch point indicator, and retention of the ''D'' signal at milepost 429.3 as an advance switch point indicator.

The reason given for the proposed changes is that the ABS system around the spring switch is not required for train operations, and a switch point indicator will provide a better operation and be less confusing to train crews.

BS–AP–No. 3407

Applicants: Chicago, Central and Pacific Railroad, Mr. John D. McPherson, Senior Vice President—Operations, Illinois Central Railroad, 17641 Ashland Avenue, Homewood, Illinois 60430–1345.

The Chicago, Central and Pacific Railroad seeks approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of the existing two aspect automatic train stop/automatic block signal system, on the